REPORT RESUMES

ED 011 675 CG 000 136

AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM FOR THE ADVISING OF FRESHMEN, FINAL REPORT TO THE LOUIS W. AND MAUD HILL FAMILY FOUNDATION.

BY- ROSSMANN, JACK E.

MACALESTER COLLEGE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

PUB DATE NOV 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.80 95P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STUDENT ATTITUDES, COLLEGE STUDENTS, *FACULTY ADVISORS, *INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT, *STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP, COLLEGES, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, OMNIBUS PERSONALITY INVENTORY, ST. PAUL

A 2-YEAR STUDY OF COLLEGE FACULTY ADVISING WITH SELECTED FRESHMEN STUDENTS WAS STUDIED AT MACALESTER COLLEGE. SIX SPECIALLY SELECTED AND PREPARED FACULTY MEMBERS WERE GIVEN RELEASED CLASSTIME TO BE MORE AVAILABLE TO THE STUDENTS ASSIGNED TO THEM. THE HYPOTHESES WERE THAT SUCH AN ADVISORY SYSTEM WOULD RESULT IN (1) GREATER RETENTION OF STUDENTS, (2) HIGHER GRADE POINT AVERAGES, (3) HIGHER SCORES ON ACADEMIC ORIENTATION ON THE OMNIBUS PERSONALITY INVENTORY, (4) HIGHER SCORES ON SCHOLARSHIP AND COMMUNITY AWARENESS ON THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES, AND (5) A GREATER SATISFACTION OF STUDENTS WITH THEIR COLLEGE AND ADVISORS. THE FINDINGS SHOWED NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE 120 STUDENTS IN THE SPECIAL PROGRAM AND A SIMILAR SAMPLE OF OTHER STUDENTS. POSSIBLE REASONS SUGGESTED FOR THE LACK OF IMPACT OF SUCH A PROGRAM WERE A CHANGING STUDENT BODY AND THE NEED FOR ADVISING TO BE TIED MORE CLOSELY TO THE CURRICULUM. THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY WERE THAT FACULTY MEMBERS SHOULD BECOME SPECIALISTS IN ACADEMIC ADVISING AND THAT COLLEGES USE UPPERCLASSMEN AS FRESHMEN ADVISORS. A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ARE SUGGESTED FOR FUTURE RESEARCH ON ADVISOR PROGRAMS. (NS)

ED011675

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
TO THE
LOUIS W. AND MAUD HILL FAMILY FOUNDATION
ON
AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM FOR THE ADVISING OF FRESHMEN

Jack E. Rossmann
Coordinator of Educational Research
Macalester College

November, 1966

CG 000 106

Acknowledgments

THE WRITER WISHES TO THANK:

The Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation whose financial support made this project possible.

Dr. Lucius Garvin, Executive Vice President and Provost and Dr. Fred Kramer, Dean of Students, for their continuing interest in and support of the project.

Professors Douglas Hatfield, James Holly, Raymond Johnson, Patricia Kane, Henry Lepp, Jack Patnode, Earl Spangler, Roger Trask, and Patricia Wiesner, the nine advisers in the experimental program who volunteered to participate in this venture and whose enthusiasm kept the project moving toward its intended goals.

Professors Howard Huelster, John Schue, and Lawrence Young, the experimental program steering committee, who helped establish guidelines in the early stages of the project.

Professors Donald MacEachern and Clyde Parker of the University of Minnesota who assisted in the design of the project and the interpretation of the data.

David Bransford, Renee Fredrickson, and Ellen Rose, three Macalester students who ably served as research assistants during the data tabulation phase of the project.

Sharon Schmidt and Mary Scott for excellent clerical assistance throughout the project.

The students in the classes of 1968 and 1969 at Macalester College for their cooperation in the collection of data.

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgements ii

Table of Contents iii

List of Tables . . . . iv - v

Foreward vi

I. INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem 1

Related Research 2

II. HYPOTHESES 7

III. METHOD 9

Selection of Advisers 9

Selection of Students 10

Assignment of Students to Advisers 10

Contacts Between Advisers and Students 11

Data Collection 13

IV. RESULTS 15

Retention 15

Academic Achievement 15

Psychometric Data 19

Questionnaire Data 23

Data from Advisers 33

V. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS 37

A Review of the Findings 37

The Value of the Program 38

Possible Reasons for the Lack of Impact 38

Implications for Advising at Macalester 40

Future Research 41

APPENDIX - A 43

APPENDIX - B 69

APPENDIX - C 72

APPENDIX - D 77

References 86

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page No.
1	A Comparison of the Experimental and Control Groups of the Classes of 1968 and 1969 on Aptitude and Achievement Measures	11
2	The Approximate Number of Times I Had Conferences With My Faculty Adviser Was:	13
3	Percentage of Experimental and Control Group Students Completing the End-of-Year Questionnaire. College and University Environment Scales, and Omnibus Personality Inventory.	14
4	Retention Rates for Class of 1968, Fall of 1965	16
5	Retention Rates for Class of 1968, Fall of 1966	16
6	Retention Rates for Class of 1969, Fall of 1966	16
7	Class of 1968 - Freshmen G.P.A.	17
8	Class of 1968 - Sophomore G.P.A..	17
9	Class of 1969 - Freshmen G.P.A.	17
10	Proportion of Experimental and Control Groups Placed on Academic Probation for Scholastic Reasons - Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data (1964-1965)	18
11	Proportion of Experimental and Control Groups Placed on Academic Probation for Scholastic Reasons - Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data (1965-1966)	18
12	Proportion of Experimental and Control Groups Placed on Academic Probation for Scholastic Reasons - Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data (1965-1966)	18
13	Experimental Group-Control Group Comparisons on the Omnibus Personality Inventory - Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data	20, 44
14	Experimental Group-Control Group Comparisons on the Omnibus Personality Inventory - Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data	20, 45
15	Experimental Group-Control Group Comparisons on the Omnibus Personality Inventory - Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data	20, 45
16	Experimental-Control Group Comparisons on the College and University Environment Scales	23, 46, 4
17	General Satisfaction With Faculty Adviser	26, 48

List of Tables - continued

Table	Title	Page No.
18	Adviser's Adequacy In Helping With Decisions	26, 48
19	Ease of Scheduling Meetings With Adviser	26, 49
20	Role Played By Faculty Adviser	26, 49
21	Feelings About The Number Of Conferences With Adviser .	26, 50
22	Perceived Effect Of Discussion With Faculty Adviser On Long Term Plans	26, 51
23	Faculty Adviser As Most Likely Source Of Help With Problems	26, 51-53
24	Reaction To Macalester	27, 54
25	Feeling About Educational Experience At Macalester College	27, 54
26	Intentions Of Graduating From Macalester	27, 55
27	Importance Of Getting Good Grades	28, 55
28	Importance Of Graduating From College	28, 56
29	Highest Educational Level Hoped For	28, 56
30	Satisfaction With Present Career Choice	29, 57
31	Most Important Purpose Of A College Education	29, 57, 58
32	Summary Of Responses To The Open-End Question - The Faculty Advising Program Could Best Be Improved By: . .	58, 59
33	Most Important Way In Which Faculty Advising Program Could Be Improved	59, 60
34	Number Of Meetings Between Students And Advisers As Recorded In Advisers' Logs	60
35	Length Of Meetings Between Students And Advisers As Recorded In Advisers' Logs	60
36	Types Of Meeting Between Students And Advisers As Recorded In Advisers' Logs	60
37	How Successful Do You Feel The Experimental Program Was In Achieving These Goals	61
38	Advisers' Responses To Open-End Questions - Spring, 1965	62-64
39	Advisers' Responses To Open-End Questions - Spring, 1966	65-68

Foreward

This report on a research project concerned with faculty advising at Macalester College can be read with at least three levels of thoroughness.

Chapter V presents a succinct summary of the outcomes and attempts to draw some implications from these findings.

For those who are interested in learning a bit more about the background of the project (its purposes, design, and a more detailed account of the findings), the first four chapters should be read.

And those who want a complete picture of the tabular data (percentages, chi-square values, t values, etc.) are encouraged to refer to the tables in the Appendix.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Problem

In the months since the student uprising at Berkeley, colleges and universities throughout the country have become increasingly aware of the concerns of students about their educational experience. One of the concerns frequently aired by students centers upon the amount and quality of student-faculty contact outside the classroom. Students, in general, desire individual interaction with members of the faculty -- and they frequently feel that this is an area where they are being short-changed.

Colleges have long suggested that one of the out-of-classroom faculty contacts which they provide for students is the faculty advising relationship. Private liberal arts colleges typically have assigned each undergraduate to an adviser who is a member of the teaching faculty. The nature of this advising relationship has varied widely, however, depending at least partially upon the motivation of the faculty member involved. To promote significant interaction between the adviser and his advisees, various incentives have been tried. At some institutions additional compensation is provided for academic advisers. This compensation may be extra pay, released time, or added prestige in the form of titles or privileges. Few data have been collected to test the assumption that these rewards improve the quality of advising.

The Macalester project was an attempt to measure the effect upon college freshmen of assigning them to faculty members who had been released from one-third of their teaching responsibility to devote more time to academic advising. Specifically, the project was concerned with whether increased opportunities for students to meet with their faculty advisers would have an impact upon such factors as: attrition, academic achievement, attitudes toward the college, and the intellectual development of the students.

Related Research

When previously published research on the impact of faculty advising is examined, the lack of well-designed studies becomes readily apparent. Most studies prior to 1960 primarily attempted to describe a particular advising program without using a control group. There are, however, recent exceptions to this descriptive study technique.

Control Group Studies. A study designed to assess the impact of spending additional advising time with college freshmen was conducted at North Carolina State by Morehead and Johnson (1964). In the academic year 1960-61 48 male freshmen majoring in electrical engineering were randomly selected from a group of 226 and were designated the "experimental group." The remaining 178 freshmen engineers constituted the "control group."

The control group students received routine advising from faculty members while those in the experimental group had, in addition to the usual faculty advising relationship, two scheduled group and two scheduled individual conferences each semester of their freshman year. These conferences dealt with college regulations, class participation, study schedule, and efficient study habits. Results indicated that the experimental group had a significantly higher freshman grade-point-average than the control group, but there were no differences between the two groups on rate of retention.

Similar results were obtained by Brown (1965) in a study using upper classmen to conduct a program of academic advising. Brown matched two groups of freshmen on the basis of sex, scholastic ability and study orientation. One group received three sessions of advising by trained upperclassmen, while the other group had no advising. The advised group earned significantly higher grades at the end of the first semester and obtained higher scores on two measures of effective study habits.

In contrast to Brown's findings, Sander (1964) found no significant differences in: 1. first semester grades; 2. enrollment for the second semester; or, 3. self-perception among three groups of students living in residence halls. One group had had four individual interviews with student residence hall advisers. Another group had four group interviews, and the third group had no interviews.

Beaumont (1939) reports on a study conducted at the University of Michigan from 1932-1937. During this period three different systems of academic counseling were used within the freshman classes. Under one system the faculty advisers spent most of their interview time reviewing the academic records of the students; under the second system the advisers spent at least some time with the students discussing their social adjustment as well as academic performance; and under the third system the counselors made at least an attempt to explore vocational goals as well as the student's academic record. Without reporting any tests of statistical significance Beaumont concluded that in terms of: 1. rate of retention; 2. academic standing; and, 3. adjustment in relationship to high school standing, the two groups of students receiving academic advising beyond that of reviewing the academic record were faring significantly better than the minimum contact group.

Descriptive Studies. As mentioned above, a number of projects have attempted to evaluate individual faculty advising programs without the use of a control group (Cameron - Miami University, 1952; Jones - Colgate University, 1950; Jones - Indiana State, 1947; Keiel - Brooklyn College, 1957; Paterson and Clark - University of Minnesota, 1943). Two of these are discussed below.

In a study at the University of Minnesota, Paterson and Clark (1943) asked students to fill out a brief questionnaire. The information obtained included: the number of conferences with their adviser; the kind of help received from the faculty adviser; a positive or negative opinion as to whether or not acquaintance with a member of the faculty other than one's instructor was beneficial; and finally a rating of the conferences with faculty advisers on a six point scale. Paterson and Clark were particularly interested in comparing the responses obtained for the academic year 1941-1942 with the two preceding years. In 1941-1942, the number of academic advisers was increased approximately fourfold and for the first time every incoming freshman was assigned an adviser.

They found that student responses in 1941-1942 were quite similar to the preceding two years. There were increases in the percentage of students receiving aid from the faculty advisers in selecting courses and suggesting part-time work, encouraging student activity, and in making the University a more friendly place. Only three items showed important decreases in the proportion of students who reported having received help: advice on vocational problems; talks about personal problems; and, discussion of emotional difficulties. The majority of the students expressed belief that the conferences with the faculty advisers were "quite helpful" and "of great value." Only 10 per cent found them of little or no value.

In an evaluation of the Brooklyn College faculty advising program, Keiel (1957) found that about half of the freshmen at Brooklyn College in 1956 felt that the area in which their faculty advisers had been of greatest help to them was course planning. Others said they had been helped in understanding college procedures, gaining information about their scholastic aptitudes and receiving help in the area of vocational guidance. Weaknesses in the program as seen by the students included lack of time spent with their advisers and advisers occasionally lacking information about courses for majors and degrees. Keiel concluded from his project that faculty advisers: should be prepared for unscheduled appointments; should know more about general requirements of the college; and know and take an interest in the student as a person but should never try to force him into one field of interest.

Variations in Faculty Advising. Evidence of the diversity in approaching the problem of faculty advising is provided in a study conducted by Jamrich in 1955. Jamrich mailed a questionnaire to 30 private liberal arts colleges requesting information about their faculty advising programs. He discovered that 40 per cent of the colleges administered the faculty advising program through the Dean of the College; about 40 per cent had the program under the Dean of Students; and the remainder administered the program under some other member of the administration. In over one-half of the colleges the advising was actually performed by department chairmen. In the remainder of the colleges the duties were divided among the members of the department. In about twenty-five per cent of the institutions, all faculty members carried an advising load. In a few institutions upper class students handled some of the freshmen advising. Only one-third of the institutions completing the questionnaire described their faculty advising program as "successful".

Among the conclusions drawn by Jamrich were these: 1. the college professor, as an adviser, can function well in a number of areas including academic achievement, reading problems, adjustment problems, awareness and subsequent referral to the proper agency, and occupational counseling and placement; 2. there should be extra remuneration for counselors and in some instances careful selection of the advisers rather than including the entire faculty; and, 3. the counseling program should be centralized under a faculty committee.

Related to Jamrich's conclusion about selection of advisers is a study conducted by Earl Koile (1955). Two groups of college teachers were compared -- one group engaged in faculty counseling, the other group not serving as faculty counselors. He found that interest in faculty counseling activities is related to: sex (women more likely to be interested than men), academic rank (instructors and assistant professors more interested than men), academic rank (instructors and assistant professors more interested than the top two faculty ranks), highest degree held (non- Ph.D.'s more interested than Ph.D.'s), age group (those age 35-54 more interested than those older or younger), teaching field (non-scientists more interested than scientists), and type of college with which the teacher is associated (liberal arts faculty members less interested than state college faculty members). Koile suggests that much additional research is needed on the influence of interest in faculty advising activities upon the process and outcomes of faculty advising.

Summary. Koile's concern about the need for research could well be expanded to the entire field of faculty advising. Recently there have been two or three attempts to compare approaches to advising using the control group method, but most previous research in the area has been primarily descriptive. In view of this relative paucity of research and the lack of consistent findings, the hypotheses tested in this study were not generated primarily from previous research or a well-developed conceptual framework but rather from certain assumptions about the possible impact of an accelerated program of academic advising. These hypotheses will be discussed in the next section.

II. HYPOTHESES

In the spring of 1963 the Macalester faculty adopted a number of goals for academic advising. These goals were:

1. To keep the student aware of the nature and breadth of a liberal arts education and to assist the student in planning for the maximum liberal arts benefits from his college experience.
2. To help the student make the transition from the high school as a level of approach to learning to the new world of the college with its greater emphasis upon the abstract, the world of ideas, the critical, the analytical and the creative.
3. To help the student develop more efficient ways of reading material, taking tests, writing papers, giving oral expression to ideas, making use of library and other resources which will heighten his effectiveness and increase his self-confidence in his ability to become an independent scholar.
4. To encourage and assist the student in seeking out the company of others who are exploring ideas.
5. To try and stimulate the student to read beyond course expectations and to provide him with a sympathetic sounding board for the ideas which he derives from such reading or other encounters.
6. To encourage the student to search for the relatedness of ideas among the various fields of study.
7. To gain sufficient rapport with the student so that some help may be given in the event that problems growing out of personal, family or other relationships may be causing anxiety or difficulty and to make appropriate referrals.

While these goals were not designed so that their degree of accomplishment could be easily measured, they did suggest certain hypotheses which could be tested. If all of these goals were effectively accomplished it might be assumed that students would be very satisfied with their educational experience and would be quite likely to complete their academic careers at Macalester. Thus, the first hypothesis: the rate of retention among students in the experimental group will be higher than those in the control group.

An advising program which places its major stress upon the academic life of the student should have an impact upon the students academic achievement. The second hypothesis tested, therefore, was: *students in the experimental group will achieve significantly higher grade-point-averages than will students in the control group*.

It was also assumed that the general intellectual climate of the advising program would have an impact not only upon academic achievement, but upon the intellectual orientation of the student as well. It was, therefore, hypothesized that: *students in the experimental group will score significantly higher on the scales of the Omnibus Personality Inventory which are designed to measure academic orientation*.

It was assumed that the experimental program would have an impact upon the way in which the campus was perceived by students. It was hypothesized, therefore, that: *the students in the experimental group would score significantly higher on the scholarship awareness and community scales of the College and University Environment Scales*.

It was also hypothesized that the students in the experimental group would *be more satisfied with their educational experience at Macalester*; *would be more satisfied with their faculty adviser*; *would be more likely to see their faculty adviser as someone to whom they could go for help with problems they encountered*; *would have a higher level of aspiration*; and *would be more satisfied with their career choice*.

The method of testing these hypotheses will be described in the next section.

III. METHOD

This section of the report outlines the procedures followed in testing the hypotheses stated in the preceding section.

The basic design of the study was the classical experimental group - control group comparison. Since the project was designed as a two-year study it provided an opportunity for both a longitudinal comparison (following one class through both their freshman and sophomore years) and a replication (repeating the project for two successive freshman classes). In an attempt to avoid confusion the following terminology will be used: the freshman class entering in the fall of 1964 will be referred to as the class of 1968 and the succeeding class as the class of 1969. Thus, four groups of students will be discussed in this report: the experimental and control groups of the class of 1968 and the experimental and control groups of the class of 1969.

Selection of Advisers

In the spring of 1964, six faculty members were selected to participate in the program. Essentially three criteria were used in choosing these faculty members: 1) an interest in the program; 2) previous experience with faculty advising at Macalester; 3) representation from a number of different departments within the college. No attempt was made to randomly select advisers from among all faculty members.

The six chosen for the first year of the program were: an assistant professor of speech; an assistant professor of psychology; an associate professor of history; two assistant professors of English; and the college librarian (who also held a faculty appointment). Three of those chosen for the first year of the program were unable to participate in the program the second year. The advisers for the second year (1965-1966), therefore, were: an assistant professor of psychology; a professor of geology; an assistant professor of history; an assistant professor of women's physical education; an assistant professor of English; and the college librarian.

Selection of Students

By the end of July, 1964, all but approximately 50 members of the 1964 freshman class at Macalester had been admitted. At that time a random sample of 60 men and 60 women was chosen from the total of 511 freshmen and was designated the experimental group. The remaining 391 freshmen became the control group.

At approximately the same time in the summer of 1965, 120 students (60 men and 60 women) were chosen for the experimental group from the freshman class of that year leaving a control group of 428. Table 1 indicates that in terms of converted high school rank (using the Educational Testing Service conversion table which considers both rank in class and size in high school and converts these to a standard score) and Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, the experimental and control groups in both years were comparable.

Assignment of Students to Advisers

Prior to the beginning of Fall Term, 1964, the 120 students in the experimental group were randomly assigned to the six faculty advisers, with 10 men and 10 women assigned to each adviser. The student's major field of interest was not considered in making the assignment to an adviser.

The following year, (1965-1966) an attempt was made to assign students on the basis of major field of interest. This was done partially because an adviser from the natural sciences was participating in the program (there had been none the preceding year); partially because there had been some adverse reaction from both students and advisers to the random assignment of the previous year; and partially to determine if any differences could be found between the methods of assignment. In 1965-1966 as in the preceding year, each adviser was assigned 10 men and 10 women.

Table 1

A Comparison of the Experimental and Control Groups of the Classes of 1968 and 1969 on Aptitude and Achievement Measures.

	Converted High School Rank			S.A.T. Verbal			S.A.T. Math		
Class of 1968	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	Mean	Std. Dev.	t
Male									
Experimental N = 60	61.6	6.0	.16	555	79	1.47	606	88	.38
Control N = 184	59.4	7.6		572	83		601	96	
Female									
Experimental N = 60	64.1	6.3	.10	590	79	.00	560	94	.37
Control N = 207	65.2	5.4		590	81		565	102	
Class of 1969									
Male									
Experimental N = 60	62.5	6.2	.94	595	86	.19	621	88	.43
Control N = 212	62.2	7.1		593	94		627	90	
Female									
Experimental N = 60	65.6	6.8	.31	610	72	.54	576	97	1.19
Control N = 216	66.6	6.7		616	75		593	94	

Contacts Between Advisers and Students

Each adviser in the experimental program had an initial meeting with his advisees during New Students Days prior to the beginning of Fall Term classes. At this meeting, the adviser explained the experimental program and made it clear that he would be able to spend additional time with his advisees during the year. The students had also received a letter during the preceding summer telling them of their selection for the program. Types and numbers of meetings between students and advisers varied widely throughout the program. Types of meetings included group meetings to discuss books, to meet with college officials, to attend plays, and to meet in the advisers' homes and individual meetings to discuss course planning, career plans, and a variety of other problems. More will be said about the nature of these meetings in a later section of the report.

The students in the springs of 1965 and 1966 were asked the approximate number of conferences they had had with their faculty adviser during that year. The data are presented in Table 2 . The freshmen in the experimental program clearly had a significantly greater number of contacts with their advisers.

Advisers' In-service Training. An attempt was made to provide an in-service training program for the experimental advisers. Throughout the two years of the program, a series of discussions among the advisers was held. By bringing to the advisers a number of the college administrators and outside consultants, an attempt was made to better acquaint the advisers with the workings of the college, the nature of the advising relationship, and the development of college students. These meetings also gave the advisers an opportunity to relate the experiences they were having with their students to one another.

In conjunction with the experimental program, a series of three symposia was sponsored by Macalester during 1964-1965. This series, concerned with the cognitive, social and emotional, and career development of the college student brought to the campus eight outstanding speakers representing these various fields.*

*The speakers were:
1) cognitive development -
    a) John Wright, University of Minnesota
    b) William Frankenaw, University of Michigan
    c) Bryon Stuckey, University of California, Santa Cruz
2) social and emotional development -
    a) Paul Heist, University of California, Berkeley
    b) Forrest Vance, University of Rochester
3) vocational development -
    a) Henry Borow, University of Minnesota
    b) John Gustad, Ohio State University
    c) John Holland, American College Testing Program

Table 2

The Approximate Number of Times I Had Conferences With My Faculty Adviser Was:

Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data

	Male		Chi-	Female		Chi-	Total		Chi-
	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square
	N=52	N=57		N=55	N=68		N=107	N=125	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
Less than 3	13*	51	17.21 (P .001)	25	62	16.16 (P .001)	20	57	33.29 (P .001)
3 or more	87	49		75	38		80	43	

Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data

	Male		Chi-	Female		Chi-	Total		Chi-
	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square
	N=45	N=43		N=56	N=53		N=101	N=96	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
Less than 3	29	53	5.50 (P<.05)	39	60	4.85 (P<.05)	35	57	10.16 (P<.01)
3 or more	71	47		61	40		65	43	

(* Although the data are presented as percentages, the chi-square values were calculated on the basis of N's.)

Data Collection

Four sources of data were used in evaluating the outcomes of the project. Grade-point-average and retention data were available from college records. The College and University Environment Scales (CUES) and Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) were administered approximately three weeks prior to the end of Spring Term in both 1965 and 1966. The O.P.I. had also been included in a battery of tests administered to the freshmen during New Student Days prior to the opening of classes. In the spring when the O.P.I. and CUES data were collected, the students were also asked to complete an eight page questionnaire (Appendix D).

Since there was no way of requiring the students to complete the tests and questionnaire, it was decided to work with a random sample of approximately 120 students from the control groups of the classes of 1968 and 1969. The 120 students from the experimental and control groups in each of the two years were sent memoranda suggesting that the college was interested in evaluating many aspects of its program and asking them to report to an assigned room on any day of the assigned week to take the tests and complete the questionnaire. Reminder notices were sent to those students who hadn't completed the instruments by Wednesday of the designated week. The percentage of response is reported in Table .

The response was above 80 per cent for all but one group (experimental males from the class of 1969) and except for 1968 sophomore females and 1969 freshmen males, the rates of response for the experimental and control groups were almost identical. Thus, non-response bias has not been regarded as a major variable in interpreting the data.

Table 3

Percentage of Experimental and Control Group Students Completing the End-of-Year Questionnaire, College and University Environment Scales, and Omnibus Personality Inventory.

	Male		Female		Total	
	Exp.	Cont.	Exp.	Cont.	Exp.	Cont.
Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data						
Number in Group	59	67	57	71	116	138
Number Completing Instruments	52	59	55	69	107	128
Percentage of Response	88%	88%	96%	97%	92%	93%
Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data						
Number in Group	43	46	52	55	95	101
Number Completing Instruments	35	37	44	53	79	90
Percentage of Response	81%	80%	85%	96%	83%	89%
Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data						
Number in Group	60	52	60	55	120	107
Number Completing Instruments	45	43	56	53	101	96
Percentage of Response	75%	83%	93%	96%	84%	90%

IV RESULTS

The outcomes of this project will be presented under five major headings: 1) Retention; 2) Academic Achievement; 3) Psychometric Data; 4) Questionnaire Data; 5) Adviser's Reactions. Only the results will be presented in this section of the report. Their implications will be discussed in the next section.

Retention

It was hypothesized that those freshmen in the experimental groups would be more likely to return to Macalester for their sophomore and junior years than would the control group students. An opportunity for greater contact with a faculty adviser would, it was felt, result in a higher rate of retention. The data in Tables 4, 5, and 6 indicate this was not true in the present study.

In the fall of 1965, a slightly higher percentage of both men and women in the experimental group returned to campus for their sophomore year, but the difference did not reach the .05 level, ~~of confidence~~. The data for 1966 make the results even more conclusive. The retention rates for the class of 1968 still do not differ significantly, while the female controls in the class of 1969 have a somewhat higher percentage of retention than the experimental females. It is apparent that greater opportunities to consult a faculty adviser did not lead to a higher retention rate by the end of the students' sophomore or junior years. Whether it will affect ultimate rate of graduation will require additional follow-up research.

Academic Achievement

Control group studies conducted by Morehead and Johnson (1964) and Brown (1965) both found increased contacts with an academic adviser resulted in significantly higher grade-point-averages for the students in the experimental group. Grade-point averages for the experimental and control groups for the present study are presented in Tables 7 , 8 , and 9 . No significant differences were found for any of the comparisons.

Table 4

Retention Rates For Class of 1968, Fall of 1965

	Men Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Square	Women Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Square	Total Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Squar
Number in Original Group	60	184		60	207		120	391	
Number returning for fall of Sophomore Year	56	167		56	173		112	340	
Percentage of Retention	93%	91%	.38 (n.s.)	93%	84%	3.63 ($P < .06$)	93%	87%	3.66 ($P < .06$)

Table 5

Retention Rates For Class of 1968, Fall of 1966

Number in Original Group	60	184		60	207		120	391	
Number returning for fall of Sophomore Year	40	122		40	125		78	246	
Percentage of Retention	67%	66%	.003 (n.s.)	67%	60%	.78 (n.s.)	65%	63%	.43 (n.s

Table 6

Retention Rates For Class of 1969, Fall of 1966

Number in Original Group	60	212		60	216		120	428	
Number returning for fall of Sophomore Year	49	171		46	185		95	356	
Percentage of Retention	82%	81%	.03 (n.s.)	77%	86%	2.78 (n.s.)	79%	83%	1.03 (n.s

Table 7

Class of 1968 - Freshmen G.P.A.

	Fall			Spring			Cumulative		
	Means	S.D.	t	Means	S.D.	t	Means	S.D.	t
Experimental Male N=59	2.46	.58	.64 (n.s.)	2.62	.49	.13 (n.s.)	2.54	.48	.29 (n.s.)
Control Male N=175	2.53	.68		2.60	.74		2.57	.67	
Experimental Female N=58	2.74	.60	.35 (n.s.)	2.87	.55	1.09 (n.s.)	2.81	.53	.85 (n.s.)
Control Female N=193	2.71	.57		2.78	.60		2.73	.57	
Experimental Total N=117	2.60	.60	.34 (n.s.)	2.74	.54	.72 (n.s.)	2.67	.52	.30 (n.s.)
Control Total N=368	2.62	.63		2.69	.67		2.65	.62	

Table 8

Class of 1968 - Sophomore G.P.A.

Experimental Male N=48	2.54	.52	.86
Control Male N=152	2.62	.57	
Experimental Female N=51	2.78	.56	.00
Control Female N=156	2.78	.48	
Experimental Total N=99	2.67	.55	.65
Control Total N=308	2.71	.53	

Table 9

Class of 1969 - Freshmen G.P.A.

Experimental Male N=60	2.56	.67	1.02 (n.s.)	2.61	.63	.53 (n.s.)	2.58	.65	.78 (n.s.)
Control Male N=201	2.65	.61		2.67	.75		2.66	.70	
Experimental Female N=59	2.83	.59	.88 (n.s.)	2.74	.77	.35 (n.s.)	2.78	.68	1.14 (n.s.)
Control Female N=209	2.90	.47		2.88	.68		2.89	.59	
Total Experimental N=119	2.69	.64	1.39 (n.s.)	2.67	.70	1.35 (n.s.)	2.68	.67	1.36 (n.s.)
Total Control N=410	2.78	.57		2.77	.72		2.77	.65	

Another measure of academic achievement examined was the comparative rate of academic probation between the two groups (Tables 10-12). At the end of 1965, a significantly higher proportion of the control group freshmen had been placed on academic probation or dropped for scholastic reasons. At the end of 1966, however, there were no significant differences between the experimental and control groups of either the classes of 1968 or 1969.

It appears, therefore, that the experimental program had no impact upon academic achievement as measured by either grade-point-average or rate of academic probation.

Proportion of Experimental and Control Groups Placed on Academic Probation or Dropped for Scholastic Reasons.

Table 10
Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data (1964-1965)

	Male Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Square	Female Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Square	Total Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Squar
Number in Group	60	184		60	207		120	391	
Number Placed on Probation or Dropped	4	26	2.33 (n.s.)	0	10	3.01 (n.s.)	4	36	4.39 ($P<.05$)
Percentage Placed on Probation or Dropped	7%	14%		0%	5%		3%	9%	

Table 11
Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data (1965-1966)

	Male Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Square	Female Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Square	Total Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Squar
Number in Group	56	167		56	173		112	340	
Number Placed on Probation or Dropped	7	19	.05 (n.s.)	2	5	.07 (n.s.)	9	24	.12 (n.s.)
Percentage Placed on Probation	12%	11%		3%	3%		8%	7%	

Table 12
Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data (1965-1966)

	Male Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Square	Female Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Square	Total Exp.	Cont.	Chi- Squar
Number in Group	60	212		60	216		120	428	
Number Placed on Probation or Dropped	6	20	.17 (n.s.)	3	9	.78 (n.s.)	9	29	.76 (n.s.)
Percentage Placed on Probation	10%	9%		5%	4%		7%	7%	

Psychometric Data

The Omnibus Personality Inventory. Since the goals of the experimental program centered upon the intellectual or academic development of the student, it was hoped there would be some method, other than grade-point-average, of comparing the experimental and control groups on this dimension. It was felt that certain scales on the Omnibus Personality Inventory (O.P.I.)* (Theoretical Orientation, Thinking Introversion, Complexity) tapped areas with which the project was concerned. To get a measure of longitudinal change on the O.P.I., Form C (575 items) of the instrument was administered to both the experimental group and a random sample of the control group in the spring of 1965 (Table 13).

These data were analyzed by comparing the experimental and control groups, by sex, for the fall testing and the spring testing. The major conclusion to be drawn from these comparisons is that the two groups did not represent random samples of the population of Macalester freshmen. For the men, differences, significant at the .05 level ~~of confidence~~ or better, on eight of the thirteen scales appear between the experimental and control groups in the spring testing.

For those scales on which there were significant differences only in the spring (Autonomy, Developmental Status, Impulse Expression, and Religious Liberalism), the changes from fall to spring were in the same direction for both experimental and control groups. On all four scales, however, the control group's mean score increased more than that of the experimental group.

For the women, differences, significant at the .05 level ~~of confidence~~ or better, on six of the thirteen scales appear between the experimental and control groups. On all but two of these scales, there were significant differences in the fall.

---

*See Appendix C for a description of the scales. The instrument has been developed within the past ten years at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California.

Table 13

Experimental Group-Control Group Comparisons on the Omnibus Personality Inventory

Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data *

	Fall Testing Males	Spring Testing Males	Fall Testing Females	Spring Testing Females
Thinking Introversion	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Theoretical Orientation	n.s.	n.s.	.05	n.s.
Estheticism	.05	.05	n.s.	n.s.
Complexity	.05	.05	n.s.	n.s.
Autonomy	n.s.	.05	.001	.001
Developmental Status	n.s.	.01	.01	.01
Impulse Expression	n.s.	.05	n.s.	n.s.
Schizoid Functioning	.01	.05	n.s.	n.s.
Social Introversion	n.s.	n.s.	.05	.01
Religious Liberalism	n.s.	.05	.05	n.s.
Social Maturity	.05	.05	.01	.01
Masculinity-Feminity	.05	.05	n.s.	.01
Repression-Suppression	.01	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 14

Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data

Thinking Introversion	n.s.	n.s.
Theoretical Orientation	n.s.	n.s.
Estheticism	n.s.	n.s.
Complexity	n.s.	n.s.
Autonomy	n.s.	n.s.
Developmental Status	n.s.	n.s.
Impulse Expression	.05	n.s.
Schizoid Functioning	n.s.	n.s.
Social Introversion	n.s.	n.s.
Religious Liberalism	n.s.	.05
Social Maturity	n.s.	n.s.
Masculinity-Feminity	n.s.	n.s.
Repression-Suppression	n.s.	n.s.

Table 15

Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data

Thinking Introversion	n.s.	n.s.
Theoretical Orientation	n.s.	n.s.
Estheticism	n.s.	n.s.
Complexity	n.s.	n.s.
Autonomy	n.s.	n.s.
Religious Orientation	n.s.	n.s.
Impulse Expression	.01	n.s.
Social Extroversion	n.s.	.05
Personal Integration	n.s.	n.s.
Anxiety Level	n.s.	n.s.
Altruism	n.s.	n.s.
Masculinity-Feminity	n.s.	n.s.
Response Bias	n.s.	n.s.
Practical Outlook	n.s.	n.s.

*Only the levels of statistical ~~confidence~~ signif. are reported - Means, standard deviations, and t values may be found in Appendix A. (Pages 44-68) The same technique is followed for the remainder of the tables in the report.

On the Complexity scale, the experimental group's average score declined slightly from fall to spring while the control group mean rose slightly. On the Masculinity-Feminity scale, the direction of change was the same for both groups and of approximately the same magnitude.

The O.P.I. was also administered to the class of 1969. In the fall, the 575 item Form C was used once again. In the spring, however, it was decided to use the shorter (390 items) and more recently developed Form Fx. Seven of the 14 scales on Form Fx bear the same titles as Form C, but almost all of the Fx scales are shorter and cannot, therefore, be considered exactly comparable to the Form C scales. Thus, the fall and spring O.P.I. testing with the class of 1969 should be viewed as testing the same groups at different points in time with similar instruments but not as a longitudinal measure.

The spring data for the men (Table 15) indicate significant differences between the experimental and control groups on only one scale, Impulse Expression. The two groups also differed, however, in the fall on the Form C Impulse Expressio scale. (Table 14).

Female spring data (Table 15) show a significant difference between the experimentals and controls on the Religious Orientation scale, but a similar difference is found on the Form C Religious Liberalism scale. (Table 14).

These data from the Omnibus Personality Inventory would seem to suggest two conclusions: 1) The experimental program generated no effects measurable by the O.P.I. which could not be accounted for by sampling error. 2) The experimental and control groups of the class of 1968 were not comparable on the variables measured by the O.P.I.

The College and University Environment Scales. It was hypothesized that participation in the experimental program would have an impact upon the perception of the campus held by the students. As one method of testing this hypothesis, all students in the experimental group and a sample of those in the control group were asked to complete the College and University Scales (CUES)* both in the spring of 1965 and the spring of 1966. Comparisons of the two groups on each of the five CUES scales are presented in Table 16.

At the end of the freshman year, there were no significant differences between the male experimental and control groups.

On the Practicality and Community scales, however, the females in the experimental group scored significantly higher than the women in the control group. These same differences held true at the end of the sophomore year, and on a third scale, Scholarship, the experimental women also scored significantly higher than the controls. Sophomore men in the experimental group scored significantly higher on the Propriety scale. For the men and women combined, there were no significant differences on both the Community and Scholarship scales at the end of the sophomore year. Apparently, the students in the experimental group of the class of 1968 are more likely than the control group students to see the campus as a friendly, but academically oriented environment.

Similar to the class of 1968 data, no differences between the male experimental and control groups for the class of 1969 were found. In contrast to the 1968 data, however, the only difference found between the experimental and control group women was on the Scholarship scale on which the control women scored significantly higher. For men and women combined, there were significant differences on both Scholarship and Awareness scales, and in both instances the control group scored higher.

Thus, the 1969 data do not support those from the class of 1968 and lead to the conclusion that if the experimental program did have an impact on the perception of the campus held by the students, this impact was quite different for the two classes. Those differences which do appear may simply be due to sampling error.

*Descriptions of the five scales are presented in Appendix B .

Table 16

Experimental-Control Group Comparisons on the College and University Environment Scales

Men

	Class of 1968 Freshmen Data	Class of 1968 Sophomore Data	Class of 1969 Freshmen Data
Practicality	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Community	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Awareness	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Propriety	n.s.	.05	n.s.
Scholarship	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Women

	Class of 1968 Freshmen Data	Class of 1968 Sophomore Data	Class of 1969 Freshmen Data
Practicality	.05	.05	n.s.
Community	.05	.05	n.s.
Awareness	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Propriety	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Scholarship	n.s.	.05	.01

Total

	Class of 1968 Freshmen Data	Class of 1968 Sophomore Data	Class of 1969 Freshmen Data
Practicality	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Community	n.s.	.05	n.s.
Awareness	n.s.	n.s.	.05
Propriety	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Scholarship	n.s.	.05	.05

Questionnaire Data

During the last week of April in 1965 and 1966 (three weeks prior to the end of the Spring Term), all students in the experimental groups and a random sample of students in the control groups were asked to complete a seven page questionnaire. The percentage of response, as reported in the methodology section, was approximately 85 per cent for all the groups.

The questionnaire was designed to determine the respondent's general satisfaction at Macalester; satisfaction and attitudes toward faculty advising; perceived sources of help for problems encountered; level of aspiration; and satisfaction with career choice. Comparisons between experimental and control groups on these variables follow.

Satisfaction with Faculty Adviser. One item from the questionnaire attempted to obtain a global measure of satisfaction with the faculty adviser. The students were asked to express their degree of satisfaction with their faculty adviser on a five-point continuum ranging from very satisfied through very dissatisfied. The data indicate that the experimental females in the class of 1968 and the experimental males and females in the class of 1969 were more likely as freshmen to be satisfied with their faculty adviser than were the students in the control group (Table 17). The experimental women in the same two classes were also more likely to feel that their faculty adviser was adequately informed (Table 18). The experimental men in the class of 1968 and the experimental women in the class of 1969 were more likely to feel that it was easy to schedule meeting with their faculty adviser than were the control groups (Table 19).

Another item on the questionnaire was concerned with the nature of the relationship between the students and their faculty advisers. The student was asked to respond to one of five options ranging from "My faculty adviser pretty much left me alone" to "My faculty adviser has been available to discuss with me intellectual issues, personal problems, and vocational goals." The data indicate (Table 20) that a significantly higher percentage of the students in the control groups for both the classes of 1968 and 1969 were likely to respond that their faculty adviser pretty much left them alone. In other words, the experimental group students were more likely to have seen their faculty adviser as someone with whom they developed some kind of relationship beyond that of program signing. For the class of 1968 sophomores who had been part of the experimental program during their freshmen year, no significant differences were found between the two categories of responses.

Related to this item was a question which asked the students their feelings about the number of conferences they had with their faculty adviser during the year just ending (Table 21). The female students in this control group were more likely to have wanted more conferences with their faculty adviser as contrasted with the women in the experimental group. These data were collected only in the spri of 1966 so no data were available from the freshmen in the class of 1968.

The students were also asked what they felt had been the effect of the discussio with the faculty adviser on their long term plans (Table 22). A higher proportion of women in the class of 1968 experimental group said discussions had been important in their long term plans as compared with the control group women of the same year. No differences were found among the freshmen in the class of 1969.

In order to get some idea of the kinds of problems which the students of the classes of 1968 and 1969 felt they could take to their faculty adviser, five problem areas and eleven possible sources of help were listed on the questionnaire. Comparison were then made between the experimental and the control group students in terms of th percentage who had responded that their faculty adviser was the person to whom they would go for help with problems in these various areas (Table 23). For the class of 1968, men in the experimental group were more likely to see their faculty adviser as someone to whom they could go for help with career planning and with study problems. Experimental women in the class saw their faculty adviser as a source of help for course planning and career planning more frequently than did the women in the control group. None of these differences carried over into the sophomore year but the experimental men in their sophomore year were more likely to see the faculty adviser as a source of help for planning courses. None of the differences found for the class of 1968 appeared in the class of 1969 data. The only significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the class of 1969 appeared in the study problems area. The experimental group women were more likely to see their faculty adviser as someone to whom they could go for help with these problems. Even here, however, only nine per cent of the women in the experimental group saw the faculty adviser as a source of help in this area.

In general, the questionnaire data indicate that the students in the experimental group were more satisfied with their faculty advisers. These is no clear-cut indication, however, that they are more likely to discuss problems with their advisers.

Table 17

General Satisfaction With Faculty Adviser

	Class of 1968 Freshmen Data	Class of 1968 Sophomore Data	Class of 1969 Freshmen Data
Men	n.s.	n.s.	.01
Women	.01	n.s.	.001
Total	.05	n.s.	.001

Table 18

Adviser's Adequacy In Helping With Decisions

Men	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Women	.05	n.s.	.05
Total	.01	n.s.	n.s.

Table 19

Ease of Scheduling Meetings With Adviser

Men	.05	n.s.	n.s.
Women	n.s.	n.s.	.05
Total	.05	n.s.	.01

Table 20

Role Played By Faculty Adviser

Men	.05	n.s.	.01
Women	.001	n.s.	.001
Total	.001	n.s.	.001

Table 21

Feelings About The Number Of Conferences With Adviser

Men		n.s.	n.s.
Women		n.s.	.05
Total		n.s.	.05

Table 22

Perceived Effect Of Discussion With Faculty Adviser On Long Term Plans

Men	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Women	.001	n.s.	n.s.
Total	.01	n.s.	n.s.

Table 23

Faculty Adviser As Most Likely Source Of Help With Problems

	Freshmen - 1968			Sophomore - 1968			Freshmen - 1969		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
Course Planning	n.s.	.05	.05	.001	n.s.	.05	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Career Planning	.05	.05	.01	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Study Problems	.001	n.s.	.001	n.s.	n.s.	.05	n.s.	.05	.01
Personal Problems	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Financial Problems	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.05	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Satisfaction With Macalester. Three items from the questionnaire were designed to elicit general reactions to Macalester College by the students in both the experimental and control groups. The first item asked the students to check whether they had liked Macalester more than they thought they would or whether it had been about what they had expected or even somewhat disappointing (Table 24). No significant differences were found between the experimental and control groups for either the classes of 1968 or 1969. Closely related to the first iem was an item which asked the students to express their feeling about their educational experience at Macalester. Comparisons were made between the percentage responding that they were very satisfied vs. those who expressed less satisfaction. Again no statistically significant differences were found between the experimental and control groups (Table 25).

Perhaps the most crucial measure of satisfaction with a collegiate educational experience is whether or not the student intends to graduate from the college in which he is currently enrolled. When asked about their intention to graduate from Macalester no differences were found between the experimental and control groups (Table 26).

Table 24

Reaction to Macalester College:

	Freshmen - 1968	Sophomores - 1968	Freshmen - 1969
Men	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Women	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 25

Feeling About Educational Experience At Macalester College

Men	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Women	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 26

Intentions of Graduating From Macalester

Men	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Women	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Level of Aspiration. Three more items on the questionnaire were intended to measure certain goals which the students in the classes of 1968 and 1969 had set for themselves both while in college and after leaving college. The first of these items asked the students the importance they attached to getting good grades. Approximately 90 per cent of all students in the sample said they attached a great deal or at least a moderate amount of importance to getting good grades. (Table 27). The only significant difference which appeared between the experimental and the control groups was in the sophomore data for the class of 1968 where the control group attached more importance to getting good grades than did the experimental group. Since this difference did not hold true for the men at the end of their freshmen year little importance can be attached to this finding.

The students were also asked the importance they attached to graduating from college (Table 28). Again, approximately 90 per cent of the students in the sample felt it was extremely or quite important to graduate from college and there were no differences between the experimental and control groups. The final item in this group asked the students the highest educational level which they hoped to achieve. The responses were grouped into those who hoped to achieve only the B.A. degree and those who hoped to achieve some advanced degree (Table 29). Again, no statistically significant differences appeared between experimental and control groups.

Table 27

Importance of Getting Good Grades

	Freshmen - 1968	Sophomores - 1968	Freshmen - 1969
Men	n.s.	.05	n.s.
Women	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 28

Importance of Graduating From College

Men	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Women	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 29

Highest Educational Level Hoped For

Men	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Women	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Total	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Satisfaction With Career Choice. One portion of the questionnaire asked the students to list their present career choice and then to express their satisfaction with that choice. Since most students in the experimental group had discussed their Strong Vocational Interest Blank profile with their faculty adviser it was hypothesized that they would be more satisfied with their present career choice than the control group students. This hypothesis was not supported for either of the two freshmen classes, but data collected from the class of 1968 at the end of their sophomore year did indicate that, in the experimental group, both the men and women were significantly more satisfied with their present career choice than were those students in the control group (Table 30). This would seem to represent a meaningful finding worthy of follow-up research during the students' remaining years in college.

Main Purpose of College Education. To obtain a measure of perceived goals of a college education, the students were asked to select which one of six listed outcomes of a college education they felt was most important. Since one of the goals of the experimental program expressed the desire that students gain maximum benefits from their liberal arts education, it was decided to examine the relationship between participation in the experimental groups and perceiving a general education as the most desirable outcome of a college education (Table 31).

Table 30

Satisfaction With Present Career Choice

	Freshmen - 1968	Sophomores - 1968	Freshmen - 1969
Men	n.s.	.01	n.s.
Women	n.s.	.05	n.s.
Total	n.s.	.001	n.s.

Table 31

Most Important Purpose of a College Education

Men	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Women	n.s.	n.s.	.05
Total	n.s.	n.s.	.05

No significant differences between the experimental and control groups were found for the class of 1968. Experimental females in the class of 1969, however, were significantly more likely to see a general education as the most desirable outcome of their college years.

Students' Suggestions for Improving Faculty Advising. Included in the questionnaire administered to the students at the end of the 1965 spring term was an open-ended item which asked the students to suggest ways in which the faculty advising program at Macalester could best be improved. Table 32 in the Appendix presents the coded responses which the students in the experimental and control groups gave to this item. It should be noted that less than half of the students responded to the item. In examining the kinds of responses which the students gave to this item and comparing the responses made by those in the experimental group with those in the control group the only two sizeable differences appear to be in the proportion of students who would have preferred to have more scheduled conferences or meetings with their faculty adviser (the controls mentioned this more frequently) and the percentage of students that want their adviser to be in their major field (experimentals more frequently mentioned this).

Recognizing the difficulties inherent in attempting to statistically analyze an open-ended item, it was decided to build upon the responses obtained the preceding spring and provide structured responses to a similar item in the spring of 1966. The students were first asked to place a check mark in front of any suggested improvements which they would like to see implemented and were then asked to go back and double check the one item they felt was most important (Table 33 in the Appendix).

When comparisons were made between the experimental and control groups as to whether or not a suggested method of improvement had been checked or left blank, five statistically significant chi-squares were found, but the results were not consistent for the freshmen and sophomores.

For the sophomores: 1) control group men more frequently wanted more individual conferences; 2) control group women felt advisers should be kept more adequately informed; 3) experimental women more frequently suggested that major field should be disregarded in assigning freshmen. (The system under which they were assigned as freshmen).

The freshmen data showed: 1) control group women more frequently wanted additional individual conferences; 2) experimental group men more frequently expressed the feeling that professors be given released time to serve as advisers.

Comparisons between the experimental and control groups on the one suggested improvement which students felt would be most important also yielded five significant differences. For the sophomores: 1) the experimental males more frequently expressed a desire for additional group meetings; 2) control males more frequently checked the item regarding selection of only qualified and interested advisers; 3) experimental females were more likely to mention the assignment of advisers within one's major field.

For the freshmen: 1) experimental females more frequently mentioned the selection of only qualified and interested advisers; 2) experimental males were more concerned that they be assigned to advisers in their major fields.

These data seem to support the earlier findings regarding a greater satisfaction with faculty advising on the part of the experimental group. However, the students in the experimental group, many of whom were assigned to advisers not in their own major field of interest, more frequently suggested that the program could be improved by considering major field when assigning freshmen.

Summary of Questionnaire Data. Data from the questionnaires administered at the end of the Spring Term in 1965 and 1966 attempted to determine the students' satisfactions with their college experiences; their faculty adviser; level of aspiration; satisfaction with present career choice; and the perceived main purpose of a college education.

The data were analyzed by a series of chi-square tests and seemed to suggest the following conclusions: 1) students in the experimental groups from both the classes of 1968 and 1969 were more likely to view their faculty adviser with satisfaction; 2) students in the experimental group, at the end of their sophomore year, were more likely to be satisfied with their present career choice. The experimental program had little or no impact upon: 1) level of aspiration as measured by perceived importance of grades; perceived importance of graduating from college; and intent to study beyond the B.A.; 2) satisfaction with total educational experience at Macalester; 3) perceived main purpose of a college education.

Data From Advisers

Log Sheet Information. Two types of information were collected from the nine advisers who were involved in the experimental program over the course of the two years. First, the advisers were asked to keep a log sheet on the kinds and frequency of contacts between themselves and each of their advisees. In examining the summaries of these log sheet data it should be kept in mind that their accuracy varied with the compulsiveness of the advisers. In other words, while record keeping is a matter of daily living for some people, for others it is an almost unbearable chore. In some instances a record of contact with the student was made immediately after the contact had ended, whereas in other instances the log sheets were tabulated a few weeks after the contact with the student.

The types of contact have been somewhat arbitrarily categorized. During the 1964-1965 academic year the advisers were asked to place the type of contact within a suggested list of categories. The categories were not meaningful for some advisers, so during the 1965-1966 academic year the advisers were simply asked to record the kind of meeting they had had with their advisees and the types of sessions were then categorized at the end of the year.

The crude data as to number, type, and length of meetings for 1964-1965 and 1965-1966 are recorded in Tables 34, 35 and 36 in the Appendix. The most notable characteristic of each table is the variation among the advisers. The range in number of meetins between the advisers and their advisees was from three to 32 duri 1964-1965 and from two to 17 during 1965-1966. In general, there were fewer contac during the second year of the program, although, as was noted earlier in both years the students in the experimental group reported a significantly greater number of contacts with their advisers as compared to students in the control group.

The length of meeting data indicated that most advisers met with most of their advisees for between five and 30 minutes, although for one adviser over half of the meetings ran longer than a half hour.

For both years of the program and for all advisers involved the most frequent kind of contact was for the purpose of course planning. Under this general heading came both program signing and more long range planning. There were variations among advisers but in general the second most frequent kind of contact was through a group meeting. Topics discussed at group meetings varied widely but included book discussions, discussions of plays, discussions with campus administrators, student leaders, etc. Other major groupings which occupied less of the contact time between the students and advisers included study problems, career planning, and personal problems. The career plans discussions seemed to generate primarily from discussions of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank but also included discussions of summer plans. The very small percentage of time devoted to personal problems corresponds closely to the advisers' desires that they not be seen as counseling psychologists but rather as faculty members concerned with the academic growth of their advisees. The general nature of the meetings seemed to correspond quite closely to the role typically played by a faculty adviser. Thus, the major difference between the role played by advisers in the experimental program and other faculty advisers would appear to be in the frequency with which they saw their advisees rather than the kinds of contacts they had with their students.

Advisers' Reactions to the Program. While the student reactions and experimental group - control group comparisons reported in earlier sections are crucial to the evaluation of the project, equally important when reaching a decision about the possible expansion of such a program are the reactions of the nine faculty advisers who participated in the program. It may be recalled that three advisers participated for both years and six advisers were involved for only one of the two years (three each year). At the end of each year the advisers were asked a number of open-ended questions about the program and were asked to evaluate its effectiveness in terms of the seven goals mentioned earlier.

Table 37 in the Appendix presents the responses of those advisers who replied to the "seven goals" evaluation portion of the questionnaire in each of the two years. They were asked to respond in terms of a continuum which ranged from very successful to very unsuccessful. In both years, the advisers seemed to be questioning the success of the program in terms of the suggested goals. The advisers during the second year of the program were less enthusiastic than were the first year advisers.

Tables 38 and 39 in the Appendix report the responses of the advisers in each of the two years to a series of open-ended questions. These questions were concerned with:

1) The ways in which the advisers felt they had been of most value to their advisees.
2) The techniques the advisers found to be most useful in working with their advisees.
3) The perceived impact on the students of devoting additional time to advising.
4) Perceived impact of the program on the advisers.
5) Major weaknesses in the program.
6) Major strengths of the program.
7) Suggestions for ongoing faculty advising program.

The responses ranged widely and no attempt will be made to summarize them. One general feeling does seem to emerge, however. Whether the advisers blame themselves or the basic nature of the program, they seem to agree that it was less successful then they had hoped it might be.

Summary of Data From Advisers. Questionnaire and log sheet data collected from the nine advisers indicated wide variations in number, length, and type of meetings they had with their advisees and a general concern about the overall value of the experimental program.

Future Participation. During the summer of 1966, the nine advisers were asked if they would be interested in participating in an advising program similar to the experimental program if it were expanded to include the entire freshman class. Only two responded with an unequivocal "yes." Four were definitely not interested because of their concern about weaknesses in the structure of the experimental program, e.g. the program was not tied in closely enough with the curriculum; students were not motivated to take advantage of the time which the faculty adviser made available to them; the goals of the program were not realistic, etc. The rest of the advisers felt they might be interested if it could be fitted in with their other academic obligations.

The implications of these reactions and the other findings will be discussed in the next section.

V. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This section of the report will attempt to draw upon the findings reported earlier and suggest certain implications for academic advising in liberal arts colleges and for possible future research in this area.

A Review of The Findings

Before implications are considered, the findings from the preceding section will be summarized. In comparing the experimental group of students who had been assigned to faculty advisers who were released from part of their teaching responsibility with the control group whose advisers were carrying a full teaching load, no significant differences were found in: 1) rate of retention; 2) academic achievement as measured by grade-point-average or academic probation; 3) level of aspiration as measured by importance of getting good grades, importance of graduating from college, and highest education level planned; 4) satisfaction with educational experience at Macalester; and, 5) intellectual orientation as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory.

The data did indicate that students in the experimental group were more likely to view their faculty adviser with satisfaction.

Statistically significant differences between the experimental and control groups were also found on two scales of the College and University Environment Scales; satisfaction with career choice; and stated purpose of a college education. Further research will be needed on these variables, however, if their meaning is to be adequately understood.

These findings seem to imply that providing additional time for faculty members to work with students increased the satisfaction with which the students viewed their faculty advising relationship but had no impact upon retention, academic achievement, or satisfaction with college.

The Value of the Program

One portion of the proposal for the experimental freshmen advising program suggested that if the "experiment indicates the program has value" the College would continue the program after its initial experimental period by expanding it to include the entire freshman class. A major task of this evaluation, therefore, was to determine whether the "program had value" in terms of the criteria which were examined.

In view of the findings summarized above, it must be concluded that the value of the experimental program has been quite limited. If it assumed that the major criterion variable which could be used to judge the outcome is the adjustment of the freshmen to the academic world as measured by retention, achievement and satisfaction with college life, the program has had essentially no impact. It has undoubtedly affected the way the nine advisers view academic advising as evidenced by their comments reported earlier. But it is unlikely that this impact is enough to warrant the financial expenditure necessary to expand the program to the entire freshman class.

The possibility remains that major differences between the experimental and control groups will require more time before they appear or that some significant criterion variables have been excluded. Anticipated future research will explore these possibilities, but in the meantime it is concluded that the results do not warrant an expansion of the program.

Possible Reasons for the Lack of Impact

When the hypothesized results of an experimental project are not supported by the findings, the task of trying to understand these outcomes remains. This section and the succeeding one deal in the realm of interpretation and conjecture and deliberately attempt to go beyond the data.

There are probably at least two major reasons why striking differences favoring the experimental group were not found. In the first place, the limited amount of previous research in this area has yielded conflicting findings and most counseling outcome research, which has relevance for this project, has found only slight, if any, differences favoring counseled groups. Therefore, it was perhaps overly optimistic to have expected significant differences between the experimental and control groups.

Second, and perhaps equally important, is the changing nature of the Macalester student body. At the time the original proposal was drafted, retention was a major concern at the college. On the average, less than 70 per cent of the members of a freshman class would return for their sophomore year and less than 40 per cent would graduate in four years. Within the past two years the retention rate has increased markedly with approximately 85 per cent of the freshmen returning as sophomores.

Related to the change in attrition is the increase in the average scholastic aptitude level of the students. Since 1961, the average verbal S.A.T. score of the entering freshman has risen from 540 to over 600. A shift of this magnitude in ability level, greater than one-half standard deviation, undoubtedly changes an entire syndrome of related factors, one of which might well be the students' need for and reactions to an intensified faculty advising program. It might well be hypothesized that higher ability students would feel less need for the kind of relationship available to them in the experimental program.

It is quite likely, therefore, that one of the major reasons the program did not prove successful, in terms of the criteria examined, was that for most students, it was not meeting a strongly felt need. Even though the goals of the program emphasized academic and intellectual advising, the general nature of the program centered upon the usual kinds of program planning typically associated with advising activities. Perhaps a more unique approach would have yielded different results.

There are undoubtedly other factors involved in the failure to find significant outcomes. In this analysis, no attempt has been made to examine what might be called interaction effects. Are variables such as aptitude level, vocational interest pattern, personality factors, or level of achievement related to the impact which the advising program had upon the students? If, for example, only lower ability students with dependent personality orientations were given an opportunity for greater contact with a faculty adviser, would the differences between an experimental and control groups become more striking? Hopefully, future research can provide tentative answers to questions such as these.

Implications for Advising at Macalester

Since the basic conclusion of this study is that releasing faculty members from part of their teaching responsibility in order to devote additional time to academic advising has very little impact upon college freshmen, what does this suggest for the future of advising at Macalester? Perhaps before decisions among alternatives can be made, a reconsideration of the goals of an advising program for freshmen should be attempted.

Should the emphasis be upon academic advising (which may be little more than information giving)? Should the program be more concerned with helping the student in a wide variety of decision-making activities? Or should a freshmen advising program attempt to concentrate its efforts upon intellectual stimulation? These as well as other possible emphases suggest a number of alternatives which the College might consider:

1. The College could continue with the same general kind of advising program which students in the control group experienced. Students would be assigned to faculty advisers within their major field of interest. The advisers would continue to carry a full teaching load and it would be emphasized that faculty advising is seen as part of the usual responsibility of any Macalester faculty member. Advisers might receive increased support from the administration, both in terms of an overt concern for the quality of faculty advising and the provision of folders, test data, etc.

2. Certain faculty members could become specialists in academic advising. Extra-classroom interests and abilities of faculty members vary widely. Some prefer committe work, some prefer academic advising, some prefer working with student organizations. Perhaps the administration could capitalize upon this diversity by making mutally exclusive out-of-classroom assignments.

3. Advising could be more closely related to the curriculum. One of the frustrations experienced by the advisers in the experimental program was the lack of means to communicate with the advisees about topics other than planning a program. There was virtually no opportunity to initiate discussions of curricular material or topics related to the curriculum.

   A possible method of relating advising of freshmen more closely to the curriculum would be to have instructors of freshmen courses serve as freshmen advisers. This could be done by asking Man and His World instructors to serve as freshmen advisers or by initiating a series of freshmen seminars to those at Harvard or Stanford.

4. Upper-class students could serve as advisers. The data in Appendix clearly show that for most problems, one of the most frequent sources of assistance to students is a fellow student. Perhaps an advising program for freshmen could capitalize upon this phenomenon. If the emphasis in the program is to be upon academic advising (information giving), freshmen could be assigned to a department rather than a specific faculty member. The student assistants working within the department could then assist the freshmen in planning their programs. Problems which the students did not feel competent to handle could be referred to a faculty member or to one of the student personnel services on campus. These services (professional counseling and residence counseling) would probably need to be expanded.

These alternatives are suggested primarily as discussion stimulators. Other approaches and combinations of the above should be considered.

Future Research

While the results of the project may suggest that the approach tried in the experimental program did not yield significant outcomes, the project should not be viewed as a wasted effort. It provided an opportunity to gain some valuable insights into the problems encountered in attempting to understand the impact of a freshmen advising program and has stimulated a number of questions which can be explored in future research.

1. What are the needs and concerns of freshmen and how can they best be met?
2. Since satisfaction with one's faculty adviser is not significantly related to satisfaction with the total educational experience, what are the factors which do seem to relate to this total satisfaction? What in the college environment affects this variable.
3. To what extent can the curriculum be more closely related to the advising system?

4. To what extent does innovation in faculty advising depend upon other innovative endeavors on a college campus?

5. Can upper-class students be used more effectively than they now are?

6. Is it possible to differentiate relatively successful from relatively unsuccessful faculty advisers? If so, are there measurable characteristics typical of each goal?

7. What are the characteristics of students which are related to differential reactions to a faculty advising program?

It is hoped that these among other questions will be explored in the near future.

APPENDIX A

Table 13

Experimental Group - Control Group Comparisons
on the
Omnibus Personality Inventory
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Fall Testing - Males					Spring Testing - Males				
	Exp.	N=50	Cont.	N=59		Exp.	N=50	Cont.	N=59	
Scales	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.	t	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.	t
TI	49.9	11.9	51.6	10.2	0.8	48.7	11.5	50.5	9.3	0.9
TO	49.8	9.6	51.0	10.2	0.6	48.7	8.8	49.4	9.6	0.4
Es	48.0	10.2	52.1	10.9	2.0*	48.2	10.0	52.8	10.3	2.4*
Co	50.2	9.9	55.0	10.2	2.5*	50.7	11.4	54.7	10.7	2.0*
Au	51.8	8.1	54.2	8.6	1.5	54.5	7.1	57.4	7.4	2.1*
Ds	49.9	9.7	53.5	10.2	1.9	54.5	8.0	59.2	9.5	3.0**
IE	49.7	11.6	53.8	12.2	1.8	52.2	11.7	56.7	11.7	2.0*
SF	42.0	9.6	47.3	10.9	2.6**	43.6	10.0	47.7	10.3	2.1*
SI	48.5	8.0	49.7	8.6	0.7	50.4	8.4	51.8	8.6	0.9
RL	49.5	7.7	50.8	9.3	0.8	50.1	7.6	53.5	8.9	2.1*
SM	51.7	8.9	55.4	9.6	2.1*	53.3	8.2	56.7	8.4	2.0*
MF	56.9	7.6	53.8	8.2	2.0*	54.8	7.7	52.1	6.4	2.0*
RS	57.2	8.3	51.5	11.6	2.9**	54.0	11.8	50.0	11.3	1.8

	Fall Testing - Females					Spring Testing - Females				
	Exp.	N=55	Cont.	N=69		Exp.	N=55	Cont.	N=69	
TI	51.1	8.9	52.9	10.2	1.0	51.5	9.5	52.3	9.7	0.5
TO	43.7	9.7	47.4	9.8	2.1*	43.9	9.1	46.0	9.5	1.2
Es	56.9	8.0	56.3	9.5	0.4	58.1	8.3	56.2	9.0	1.2
Co	50.4	11.0	53.5	9.3	1.7	49.9	11.1	54.3	9.8	2.3*
Au	50.1	8.1	55.2	8.1	3.4***	54.0	8.7	59.4	7.3	3.8***
Es	45.8	9.6	50.0	8.2	2.6**	50.6	9.5	56.0	9.3	3.2**
IE	46.7	11.9	45.1	9.0	0.8	49.5	12.2	48.8	9.8	0.3
SF	45.7	10.3	45.0	10.1	0.3	46.9	11.0	46.2	10.6	0.4
SI	45.6	9.3	50.1	10.1	2.5*	46.4	9.4	51.3	9.2	2.9**
RL	45.9	7.7	48.8	7.7	2.1*	48.4	7.9	51.2	7.8	2.0
SM	52.2	9.2	56.8	8.5	2.9**	54.7	9.3	59.1	8.0	2.8**
MF	40.7	7.7	43.1	6.7	1.4	40.0	6.0	42.9	5.5	2.7**
RS	54.2	11.0	55.9	10.5	0.9	51.7	11.6	53.5	11.0	0.9

* - .05 level ~~of confidence~~
** - .01 level ~~of confidence~~
*** - .001 level ~~of confidence~~

Table 14

Experimental Group - Control Group Comparisons
on the
Omnibus Personality Inventory
(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Fall Testing - Males					Fall Testing - Females				
	Exp.	N=44	Cont.	N=39		Exp.	N=57	Cont.	N=52	
Scales	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.	t	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.	t
TI	52.3	11.6	50.0	10.9	.9	51.9	9.2	52.8	11.0	.5
TO	51.1	10.1	49.6	9.2	.7	44.5	9.3	46.1	11.0	.9
Es	52.0	11.5	51.8	10.4	.1	57.3	7.5	55.7	9.5	1.0
Co	55.1	9.5	54.3	10.5	.4	52.7	9.2	50.7	11.6	.9
Au	55.4	7.1	55.1	9.4	.2	55.9	7.9	55.1	8.9	.5
Ds	53.3	8.8	56.1	10.1	1.4	50.6	9.4	47.8	9.4	1.5
IE	52.0	9.9	56.7	9.2	2.2*	46.4	9.1	44.0	9.4	1.4
SF	46.0	10.1	46.9	11.4	.4	44.7	8.8	43.3	10.0	.8
SI	51.5	10.9	50.3	11.1	.5	48.0	9.8	48.0	10.3	.0
RL	50.6	9.0	50.6	10.5	.0	49.8	8.4	46.1	7.6	2.5*
SM	55.9	8.0	55.2	9.8	.3	56.3	7.1	54.9	9.9	.9
MF	54.9	7.7	54.0	7.9	.5	41.1	7.1	41.6	8.2	.3
RS	53.2	9.5	50.4	11.7	1.2	56.3	9.4	56.9	10.2	.3

Table 15

	Spring Testing - Males					Spring Testing - Females				
	Exp.	N=44	Cont.	N=39		Exp.	N=57	Cont.	N=52	
TI	50.5	9.9	49.8	10.5	.3	51.6	8.6	52.1	10.6	.3
TO	52.0	10.1	49.3	10.0	1.2	45.0	9.1	46.9	10.4	1.0
Es	50.0	9.6	51.3	9.2	.6	56.4	6.7	54.7	8.7	1.1
Co	52.8	8.9	54.2	9.0	.7	52.4	7.6	50.6	10.5	1.0
Au	58.2	8.2	59.9	8.2	1.0	59.7	6.7	59.5	7.6	.1
RO	55.4	8.6	56.6	9.6	.6	54.6	7.6	51.4	6.8	2.3*
IE	51.5	9.7	57.6	10.6	2.7**	49.8	9.0	47.7	9.0	1.2
SE	44.5	10.3	46.7	10.8	1.0	50.5	10.6	50.0	10.0	.3
PI	54.8	10.2	53.1	11.0	.7	55.4	9.3	56.1	9.1	.4
AL	53.6	8.9	50.6	11.2	1.4	53.1	8.6	52.1	10.6	.5
Am	49.1	11.4	48.2	8.1	.4	57.5	9.0	58.2	9.4	.4
MF	54.5	7.5	52.9	9.1	.9	42.0	6.5	43.7	7.5	1.3
RB	50.7	9.7	46.4	9.4	2.0	46.8	10.5	49.8	11.0	1.4
PO	45.4	9.0	44.5	9.1	.9	42.4	7.1	43.1	7.2	.5

* - significant at the .05 level ~~of confidence~~
** - significant at the .01 level ~~of confidence~~
*** - significant at the .001 level ~~of confidence~~

Table 16
Experimental - Control Group Comparisons
on the
College and University Environment Scales
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

Men

	Experimental		Control		
	N = 50		N =63		
	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.	t
Practicality	14.9	3.6	14.2	4.0	.96 (n.s.)
Community	18.1	4.4	17.5	5.0	.62 (n.s.)
Awareness	20.6	4.4	19.8	5.2	.85 (n.s.)
Propriety	19.0	4.8	17.9	4.5	1.81 (n.s.)
Scholarship	17.9	4.0	17.4	4.6	.65 (n.s.)

Women

	N = 55		N =73		
Practicality	13.9	3.6	12.3	3.6	2.67 *
Community	21.2	3.9	19.7	3.9	2.11 *
Awareness	21.0	5.4	22.3	4.6	1.49 (n.s.)
Propriety	19.2	4.8	19.9	4.2	.81 (n.s.)
Scholarship	18.4	4.8	18.5	4.2	.10 (n.s.)

Total

	N = 105		N =136		
Practicality	14.4	3.6	13.3	3.7	1.95 (n.s.)
Community	19.7	4.4	18.7	4.6	1.73 (n.s.)
Awareness	20.8	4.9	21.1	5.0	.29 (n.s.)
Propriety	19.3	4.8	18.9	4.4	.80 (n.s.)
Scholarship	18.3	4.4	17.9	4.4	.82 (n.s.)

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

Men

	N = 34		N = 36		
Practicality	13.5	3.4	13.3	3.6	.24 (n.s.)
Community	16.8	3.9	15.5	3.6	1.44 (n.s.)
Awareness	19.7	5.0	20.1	4.4	.30 (n.s.)
Propriety	15.5	3.9	13.4	3.0	2.5 *
Scholarship	19.9	5.7	18.9	4.7	.80 (n.s.)

Women

	N = 44		N = 50		
Practicality	11.9	3.9	10.2	3.2	2.33 *
Community	17.8	3.9	16.2	3.8	2.02 *
Awareness	21.4	5.2	19.7	4.6	1.69 (n.s.)
Propriety	15.0	4.7	16.0	3.9	1.14 (n.s.)
Scholarship	20.5	4.2	18.4	4.9	2.26 *

Total

	N = 78		N = 86		
Practicality	12.5	3.8	11.4	3.7	1.73 (n.s.)
Community	17.3	3.9	15.9	3.8	2.46 *
Awareness	20.6	5.2	19.8	4.5	1.26 (n.s.)
Propriety	15.1	4.3	14.9	3.8	.91 (n.s.)
Scholarship	20.2	4.8	18.5	4.8	2.07 *

* Significant at the .05 level ~~of confidence.~~

Table 16 continued

Experimental - Control Group Comparisons
on the
College and University Environment Scales
(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Experimental		Control		
Men	N = 44		N = 41		
	Means	S.D.	Means	S.D.	t
Practicality	12.1	3.4	12.4	3.1	.43 (n.s.)
Community	15.8	4.6	16.7	4.4	.93 (n.s.)
Awareness	20.1	5.3	21.6	4.8	1.37 (n.s.)
Propriety	15.3	3.7	15.0	3.5	.39 (n.s.)
Scholarship	19.5	5.0	19.9	5.3	.36 (n.s.)
Women	N = 58		N = 53		
Practicality	10.9	3.1	10.9	2.8	.0 (n.s.)
Community	16.6	4.1	17.6	4.3	1.25 (n.s.)
Awareness	19.9	5.1	21.5	4.3	1.79 (n.s.)
Propriety	16.9	4.2	16.1	4.4	.98 (n.s.)
Scholarship	18.9	4.8	21.5	4.3	2.99 **
Total	N = 102		N = 94		
Practicality	11.4	3.3	12.1	3.0	.34 (n.s.)
Community	16.2	4.3	17.1	4.3	1.58 (n.s.)
Awareness	20.0	5.2	21.5	4.5	2.23 *
Propriety	16.1	3.2	15.6	4.1	1.13 (n.s.)
Scholarship	19.1	4.8	20.8	4.8	2.16 *

* - significant at .05 level ~~of confidence~~
** - significant at .01 level ~~of confidence~~

Table 17

Taking everything into consideration, my feeling about the faculty adviser I have had this year is:

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male		Chi-Square	Female		Chi-Square	Total		Chi-Square
	Exp.	Cont.		Exp.	Cont.		Exp.	Cont.	
	N=52	N=57		N=55	N=68		N=107	N=125	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
I'm very satisfied	40	37	.14 n.s.	53	26	8.88 $P<.05$	47	31	5.88 $P<.05$
Less than very satisfied	60	63		47	74		53	69	

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=34	N=37		N=44	N=52		N=78	N=89	
I'm very satisfied	47	38	.62 n.s.	54	38	2.48 n.s.	40	34	2.88 n.s.
Less than very satisfied	53	62		46	62		60	66	

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=45	N=43		N=56	N=53		N=101	N=96	
I'm very satisfied	55	30	5.75 $P<.01$	57	19	16.84 $P<.001$	56	24	21.52 $P<.001$
Less than very satisfied	45	70		43	81		44	76	

Table 18

In helping with decisions I had to make this year, I felt my faculty adviser was:

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=52	N=56		N=55	N=63		N=107	N=119	
Adequately informed	82	73	1.40 n.s.	89	70	6.52 $P<.05$	86	71	7.03 $P<.01$
Inadequately informed	18	27		11	30		14	29	

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=34	N=37		N=43	N=52		N=77	N=89	
Adequately informed	79	78	.01 n.s.	88	82	.67 n.s.	84	81	.39 n.s.
Inadequately informed	21	22		12	18		16	19	

Table 18 continued

In helping with decisions I had to make this year, I felt my faculty adviser was:
(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Male		Chi-	Female		Chi-	Total		Chi-
	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square
	N=44	N=41		N=54	N=51		N=98	N=92	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
Adequately informed	82	85	.19 n.s.	85	69	4.08 P<.05	83	76	1.71 n.s.
Inadequately informed	18	15		15	31		17	24	

Table 19

Scheduling meetings with my faculty adviser this year has been:
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	N=52	N=57		N=55	N=57		N=107	N=121	
Easy	94	79	5.35 P<.05	89	86	.27 n.s.	91	83	3.98 P<.05
Difficult	6	21		11	14		9	17	

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	N=33	N=37		N=43	N=50		N=76	N=87	
Easy	91	78	2.07 n.s.	80	84	.11 n.s.	86	82	.45 n.s.
Difficult	9	22		20	16		14	18	

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	N=45	N=41		N=55	N=50		N=100	N=91	
Easy	96	85	2.64 n.s.	95	78	6.20 P<.05	95	81	8.75 P<.01
Difficult	5	15		5	22		5	19	

Table 20

My faculty adviser this year has:
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	N=52	N=57		N=55	N=68		N=107	N=125	
Pretty much left me alone and simply signed my program of courses	19	40	5.75 P<.05	15	60	25.05 P<.001	17	50	28.60 P<.001
Helped me plan my program or been available to discuss problems with me	81	60		85	40		83	50	

Table 20 continued

My faculty adviser this year has:
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	Male		Chi-	Female		Chi-	Total		Chi-
	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square
	N=34	N=37		N=44	N=52		N=78	N=89	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
Pretty much left me alone and simply signed my program of courses	35	19	2.42 n.s.	27	40	1.82 n.s.	31	31	.001 n.s.
Helped me plan my program or been available to discuss problems with me	65	81		73	60		69	69	

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=45	N=43		N=56	N=53		N=101	N=96	
Pretty much left me alone and simply signed my program of courses	18	44	7.21 P<.01	18	55	16.10 P<.001	18	50	22.87 P<.001
Helped me plan my program or been available to discuss problems with me	82	56		82	45		82	50	

Table 21

Thinking about the number of conferences I have had with my faculty adviser this year:
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=34	N=36		N=44	N=52		N=78	N=88	
I would like to have had more	21	33	1.44 n.s.	34	40	.40 n.s.	28	37	1.61 n.s.
I would like to have had fewer or the number has been about right	79	67		66	60		72	63	

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=45	N=42		N=56	N=53		N=101	N=95	
I would like to have had more	29	33	.20 n.s.	29	49	4.82 P<.05	28	42	3.85 P<.05
I would like to have had fewer or the number has been about right	71	67		71	51		72	58	

Table 22

What has been the effect of discussions with a faculty adviser on your long term plans?

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=52	N=59		N=55	N=69		N=107	N=128	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
Important	64	61		80	45		72	52	
			.07 n.s.			15.75 P<.001			9.45 P<.0
Unimportant or Had No Discussion	36	39		20	55		28	48	

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=34	N=36		N=43	N=53		N=77	N=89	
Important	76	72		79	72		78	72	
			.16 n.s.			.69 n.s.			.78 n.s.
Unimportant or Had No Discussion	24	28		21	28		22	28	

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=44	N=42		N=56	N=53		N=100	N=95	
Important	59	57		59	45		59	50	
			.04 n.s.			2.03 n.s.			1.41 n.s.
Unimportant or Had No Discussion	41	43		41	55		41	50	

Table 23

Most Likely Source of Help With Problems

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Course Planning								
	N=52	N=59		N=55	N=69		N=107	N=128	
Faculty Adviser	69	58		74	56		72	57	
			1.60 n.s.			4.34 P<.05			4.75 P<.0
Other source of help	31	42		26	44		28	43	
	Career Planning								
Faculty Adviser	54	30		38	22		46	26	
			6.20 P<.05			4.02 P<.05			7.97 P<.0
Other source of help	46	70		62	78		54	74	

Table 23 continued

Most Likely Source of Help With Problems
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp. N=52 %	Cont. N=59 %	Chi-Square	Female Exp. N=55 %	Cont. N=69 %	Chi-Square	Total Exp. N=107 %	Cont. N=128 %	Chi-Square
Study Problems									
Faculty Adviser	29	3	13.80 P<.001	13	6	1.80 n.s.	21	5	16.88 P<.001
Other sources of help	71	97		87	94		79	95	
Personal Problems									
Faculty Adviser	10	2	3.39 n.s.	5	3	.52 n.s.	7	2	.10 n.s.
Other sources of help	90	98		95	97		93	98	
Financial Problems									
Faculty Adviser	2	5	.74 n.s.	5	1	1.72 n.s.	4	3	.12 n.s.
Other sources of help	98	95		95	99		96	97	

Most Likely Source of Help With Problems
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	N=34	N=37		N=44	N=53		N=78	N=90	
Course Planning									
Faculty Adviser	100	65	13.57 P<.001	68	72	.64 n.s.	82	71	4.00 P<.05
Other sources of help	0	35		32	28		18	29	
Career Planning									
Faculty Adviser	62	41	3.19 n.s.	34	45	1.25 n.s.	46	43	.14 n.s.
Other sources of help	38	59		66	55		54	57	
Study Problems									
Faculty Adviser	18	5	2.66 n.s.	5	0	1.68 n.s.	10	2	4.82 P<.05
Other sources of help	82	95		95	100		90	98	

Table 23 continued

Most Likely Source of Help With Problems
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	Male		Chi-	Female		Chi-	Total		Chi-
	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square
	N=34	N=37		N=44	N=53		N=78	N=90	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
		Personal Problems							
Faculty Adviser	9	5	.32 n.s.	2	6	.70 n.s.	5	6	.02 n.s
Other sources of help	91	95		98	94		95	94	
		Financial Problems							
Faculty Adviser	9	0	3.41 n.s.	2	0	1.22 n.s.	5	0	4.73 P<.
Other sources of help	91	100		98	100		95	100	
	(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)								
	N=45	N=43		N=56	N=53		N=101	N=96	
		Course Planning							
Faculty Adviser	62	51	1.10 n.s.	73	72	1.10 n.s.	68	63	.71 n.s
Other sources of help	38	49		27	28		32	37	
		Career Planning							
Faculty Adviser	31	28	.11 n.s.	29	28	.0001 n.s.	30	28	.08 n.s
Other sources of help	69	72		71	72		70	72	
		Study Problems							
Faculty Adviser	4	0	1.96 n.s.	9	0	4.96 P<.05	7	0	6.90 P<.
Other sources of help	96	100		91	100		93	100	
		Personal Problems							
Faculty Adviser	2	0	.97 n.s.	7	4	.59 n.s.	5	2	1.18 n.s
Other sources of help	98	100		93	96		95	98	
		Financial Problems							
Faculty Adviser	0	0	.00 n.s.	5	6	.01 n.s.	3	3	.00 n.s
Other sources of help	100	100		95	94		97	97	

Table 24

The Statement Which Best Summarizes My Reaction To Macalester Is:

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=52	N=57		N=54	N=68		N=106	N=125	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
I've liked it even more than I thought	42	49	.79 n.s.	57	47	1.37 n.s.	50	48	.04 n.s.
It has been about what I expected or even more disappointing	58	51		43	53		50	52	
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)									
	N=34	N=33		N=40	N=49		N=74	N=82	
I've liked it even more than I thought	35	24	.98 n.s.	20	16	.20 n.s.	27	19	1.24 n.s.
It has been about what I expected or even more disappointing	65	76		80	84		73	81	
(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)									
	N=44	N=39		N=56	N=53		N=100	N=92	
I've liked it even more than I thought	23	28	.33 n.s.	27	30	.15 n.s.	25	29	.46 n.s.
It has been about what I expected or even more disappointing	77	72		73	70		75	71	

Table 25

Taking Everything Into Consideration, My Feeling About My Educational Experience At Macalester Is:

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=52	N=58		N=55	N=69		N=107	N=127	
I'm very satisfied	40	40	.01 n.s.	47	45	.07 n.s.	44	42	.11 n.s.
I'm less than very satisfied	60	60		53	55		56	58	
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)									
	N=34	N=36		N=43	N=53		N=77	N=89	
I'm very satisfied	32	22	.91 n.s.	23	19	.28 n.s.	27	20	1.14 n.s.
I'm less than very satisfied	68	78		77	81		73	80	

Table 25 continued

Taking Everything Into Consideration, My Feeling About My Educational Experience At Macalester Is:

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp. N=44	Male Cont. N=42	Chi-Square	Female Exp. N=56	Female Cont. N=52	Chi-Square	Total Exp. N=100	Total Cont. N=94	Chi-Square
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
I'm very satisfied	23	31	2.29 n.s.	21	27	1.61 n.s.	22	29	3.44 n.s.
I'm less than very satisfied	77	69		79	73		78	71	

Table 26

Do You Intend To Graduate From Macalester?

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	N=52	N=59		N=55	N=69		N=107	N=128	
Yes	77	75	.08 n.s.	69	72	.06 n.s.	73	73	.00 n.s.
No or Undecided	23	25		31	28		27	27	

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	N=34	N=37		N=44	N=53		N=78	N=90	
Yes	82	76	.47 n.s.	75	83	.95 n.s.	78	80	.08 n.s.
No or Undecided	18	24		25	17		22	20	

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	N=45	N=43		N=56	N=53		N=101	N=96	
Yes	67	72	.30 n.s.	45	62	3.40 n.s.	54	67	3.07 n.s.
No or Undecided	33	28		55	38		46	33	

Table 27

How Much Importance Do You Attach To Getting Good Grades?

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	N=52	N=59		N=55	N=69		N=107	N=128	
Great Deal or Moderate Amount	92	94	.32 n.s.	92	95	.11 n.s.	93	94	.39 n.s.
Little or None	8	6		8	5		7	6	

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	N=34	N=37		N=44	N=53		N=78	N=90	
Great Deal or Moderate Amount	82	97	4.45 $P<.05$	93	91	.22 n.s.	88	93	1.22 n.s.
Little or None	18	3		7	9		12	7	

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	N=46	N=42		N=56	N=53		N=102	N=95	
Great Deal or Moderate Amount	85	81	.19 n.s.	95	91	.68 n.s.	90	86	.72 n.s.
Little or None	15	19		5	9		10	14	

Table 28

Importance Of Graduating From College:
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male		Chi-Square	Female		Chi-Square	Total		Chi-Square
	Exp.	Cont.		Exp.	Cont.		Exp.	Cont.	
	N=52	N=59		N=55	N=69		N=107	N=128	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
Extremely or Quite Important	96	94	.46 n.s.	88	88	.04 n.s.	91	90	.07 n.s.
Fairly or Not Very Important	4	6		13	11		9	9	
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)									
	N=33	N=37		N=44	N=52		N=77	N=89	
Extremely or Quite Important	91	78	2.10 n.s.	93	90	.24 n.s.	92	85	1.89 n.s.
Fairly or Not Very Important	9	2		7	10		8	15	
(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)									
Extremely or Quite Important	89	97	1.70 n.s.	82	85	.15 n.s.	85	90	.91 n.s.
Fairly or Not Very Important	11	3		18	15		15	9	

Table 29

What Is The Highest Educational Level You Plan To Achieve?
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp.	Male Cont.	Chi-Square	Female Exp.	Female Cont.	Chi-Square	Total Exp.	Total Cont.	Chi-Square
	N=53	N=57		N=55	N=68		N=108	N=125	
B.A. Degree	29	23	.44 n.s.	60	57	.15 n.s.	45	42	.24 n.s.
An Advanced Degree	71	77		40	43		55	58	
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)									
	N=34	N=37		N=44	N=52		N=78	N=89	
B.A. Degree	29	22	.57 n.s.	52	54	.02 n.s.	42	40	.06 n.s.
An Advanced Degree	71	78		48	46		58	60	
(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)									
	N=45	N=42		N=55	N=52		N=100	N=94	
B.A. Degree	18	7	.02 n.s.	46	46	.005 n.s.	33	33	.001 n.s.
An Advanced Degree	82	93		54	54		67	67	

Table 30

Satisfaction With Present Career Choice

	Male		Chi-	Female		Chi-	Total		Chi-
	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square	Exp.	Cont.	Square
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)	N=52	N=59		N=55	N=69		N=107	N=128	
	%	%		%	%		%	%	
Satisfied	80	76	.33 n.s.	72	82	1.75 n.s.	76	80	1.32 n.s.
Dissatisfied or Undecided	20	24		28	18		24	20	
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)	N=34	N=37		N=44	N=53		N=78	N=90	
Satisfied	97	76	6.69 $P<.01$	95	79	5.44 $P<.05$	96	78	11.94 $P<.001$
Dissatisfied or Undecided	3	24		5	21		4	22	
(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)	N=43	N=41		N=54	N=53		N=97	N=94	
Satisfied	74	59	2.38 n.s.	80	73	.91 n.s.	77	66	3.04 n.s.
Dissatisfied or Undecided	26	41		20	27		23	34	

Table 31

Most Important Purpose Of A College Education

(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)	N=51	N=58		N=55	N=68		N=106	N=126	
General Education	43	36	.55 n.s.	45	43	.01 n.s.	43	40	.51 n.s.
Vocational Training									
Learning to get along with people									
Developing a knowledge of world problems									
Developing ethical standards									
Preparation for marriage and family *	57	64		55	57		57	60	
(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)									
General Education	50	40	.87 n.s.	48	64	2.61 n.s.	49	54	.45 n.s.
Vocational Training									
Learning to get along with people									
Developing a knowledge of world problems									
Developing ethical standards									
Preparation for marriage and family *	50	60		52	36		51	46	

* Percentage given is the total of these five categories.

Table 31 continued

Most Important Purpose Of A College Education
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp. N=45 %	Male Cont. N=42 %	Chi-Square	Female Exp. N=56 %	Female Cont. N=53 %	Chi-Square	Total Exp. N=101 %	Total Cont. N=95 %	Chi-Square
General Education	47	31		64	45		56	40	
			2.25 n.s.			3.97 $P < .05$			6.00 $P < .0$
Vocational Training									
Learning to get along with people									
Developing a knowledge of world problems									
Developing ethical standards									
Preparation for marriage and family	53	69		36	55		44	60	

Table 32

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE OPEN-END QUESTION THE FACULTY ADVISING PROGRAM COULD BEST BE IMPROVED BY:
(Class of 1968 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp. N=21 %	Male Cont. N=22 %	Female Exp. N=28 %	Female Cont. N=35 %	Total Exp. N=49 %	Total Cont N=57 %
Having more scheduled conferences or meetings	5	27	18	26	12	26
Having advisers show more interest in students	10	9	7	17	8	14
Keeping advisers better informed	5	5	11	6	8	5
Giving all professors more time for advising	-	5	4	6	2	5
Selecting only qualified and interested advisers	-	-	7	11	4	7
Letting a student select his own adviser	5	9	-	6	2	7
Having an adviser in one's major field	24	9	7	-	14	4
Have more informal talks	5	-	4	6	4	4
Having more group activities	10	5	7	-	8	2
Letting the student decide whether or not he wants to use adviser	10	5	-	3	4	2
Having students take more initiative	-	5	-	3	-	4
Other suggested improvements	19	9	18	3	18	5
It's fine as it is	10	18	18	14	14	16

Table 32 continued

All Possible Ways In Which Faculty Advising Program Might Be Improved:

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	Male		Female		Total	
	Exp.	Cont.	Exp.	Cont.	Exp.	Cont.
	N=34	N=37	N=44	N=53	N=78	N=90
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Opportunity for more individual conferences	29	54*	57	51	45	52
Opportunity for more group conferences	24	11	21	13	22	12
Release time for professors to serve as faculty adviser	24	16	27	25	26	21
Keep advisers more adequately informed	59	35	50	75*	54	48
Select only qualified and interested advisers	59	65	68	79	64	73
Assign freshmen to advisers in their major field	53	46	55	60	54	54
Assign freshmen to advisers without regard to major field	18	11	18	4*	18	7*
Man and His World instructors as freshmen advisers	12	11	9	9	10	10
Other	6	8	0	2	3	4
It's fine as it is	15	22	9	11	12	16

(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	N=45	N=43	N=56	N=53	N=101	N=96
Opportunity for more individual conferences	38	35	30	55*	34	46
Opportunity for more group conferences	18	7	18	23	18	16
Release time for professors to serve as faculty adviser	42	19*	25	36	33	28
Keep advisers more adequately informed	56	40	50	76	53	59
Select only qualified and interested advisers	62	58	91	83	78	72
Assign freshmen to advisers in their major field	71	65	68	74	69	70
Assign freshmen to advisers without regard to major field	13	2	9	6	11	4
Man and His World instructors as freshmen advisers	11	2	9	4	10	3
Other	4	5	0	4	2	4
It's fine as it is	18	23	7	4	12	13

Table 33

Most Important Way In Which Faculty Advising Program Could Be Improved

(Class of 1968 - Sophomore Data)

	N=25	N=31	N=33	N=42	N=58	N=73
Opportunity for more individual conferences	20	16	15	24	17	21
Opportunity for more group conferences	20	0*	3	2	10	1*
Release time for professors to serve as faculty adviser	0	7	9	7	5	7
Keep advisers more adequately informed	24	10	12	14	17	12
Select only qualified and interested advisers	16	42*	39	45	29	44
Assign freshmen to advisers in their major field	12	10	18	2*	16	6
Assign freshmen to advisers without regard to major field	0	0	3	0	2	0
Man and His World instructors as freshmen	0	3	0	0	0	1
Other	8	10	0	2	3	6
It's fine as it is	0	3	0	2	0	3

Table 33 continued

Most Important Way In Which Faculty Advising Program Could Be Improved
(Class of 1969 - Freshmen Data)

	Male Exp. N=35	Male Cont. N=31	Female Exp. N=47	Female Cont. N=43	Total Exp. N=82	Total Cont. N=74
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Opportunity for more individual conferences	11	19	6	14	9	16
Opportunity for more group conferences	3	3	4	7	4	5
Release time for professors to serve as faculty adviser	0	3	2	7	1	5
Keep advisers more adequately informed	9	19	6	16	7	18
Select only qualified and interested advisers	34	36	62	40*	50	38
Assign freshmen to advisers in their major field	37	13*	17	9	26	11*
Assign freshmen to advisers without regard to major field	3	0	0	2	1	1
Man and His World instructors as freshmen advisers	0	3	2	0	1	1
Other	0	0	0	2	0	1
It's fine as it is	3	3	0	2	1	3

* Significant at the .05 level ~~of confidence.~~

Table 34

Number of Meetings Between Students and Advisers As Recorded In Advisers' Logs

	1964-1965						1965-1966				
Adviser	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5*
Range	4-20	17-32	7-14	9-19	3-12	6-15	5-17	3-7	7-12	2-6	3-9
Median	8	23	9	14.5	6	9	10	5	9	3	5

Table 35

Length of Meetings Between Students and Advisers As Recorded In Advisers' Logs

	1964-1965						1965-1966			
Adviser	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Less than five minutes	16	70	4	19	27	16	1	32	5	0
Five to Thirty minutes	81	14	18	27	45	72	74	68	42	99
Over Thirty minutes	3	16	78	54	27	12	24	0	53	0

* Log data were not available from one adviser

Table 36

Types Of Meeting Between Students And Advisers As Recorded In Advisers' Logs

	1964-1965							1965-1966					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Med.	1	2	3	4	5	Med.
Course Planning	43	39	29	44	49	58	41%	65	71	32	56	41	56%
Group Meetings	21	12	45	20	0	0	17%	21	0	31	0	57	21%
Study Problems	14	18	4	13	13	22	13%	3	1	9	35	1	3%
General Discussion	12	23	5	16	16	13	14%	2	13	7	3	0	3%
Career Planning	8	4	13	8	23	5	8%	5	12	9	1	0	5%
Personal Problems	2	2	3	0	0	1	2%	0	1	2	3	0	1%
Other	0	2	1	0	0	0	0%	3	1	2	5	0	2%

Table 37

How Successful Do You Feel The Experimental Program Was In Achieving These Goals?

A. To keep the student aware of the nature and breadth of a liberal arts education and to assist the student in planning for maximum benefits from his college experience.

	N=5	N=6
	1965*	1966
Very successful	20%	--
Fairly successful	60%	67%
Mixed feelings	20%	33%

B. To help the student make the transition from the high school as a level of approach to learning to the new world of the college with its greater emphasis upon the abstract, the world of ideas, the critical, the analytical and the creative.

Very successful	20%	--
Fairly successful	40%	50%
Mixed feelings	40%	50%

C. To help the student develop more efficient ways of reading material, taking tests, writing papers, giving oral expression to ideas, making use of library and other resources which will heighten his effectiveness and increase his self-confidence in his ability to become an independent scholar.

Very successful	20%	--
Fairly successful	40%	--
Mixed feelings	40%	50%
Fairly unsuccessful	--	33%
Very unsuccessful	--	16%

D. To encourage and assist the student in seeking out the company of others who are exploring ideas.

Very successful	--	16%
Fairly successful	--	33%
Mixed feelings	80%	16%
Fairly unsuccessful	20%	16%
Very unsuccessful	--	16%

E. To try to stimulate the student to read beyond course expectations and to provide him with a sympathetic sounding board for the ideas which he desires from such reading or other encounters.

Fairly successful	40%	--
Mixed feelings	20%	50%
Fairly unsuccessful	40%	33%
Very unsuccessful	--	16%

F. To encourage the student to search for the relatedness of ideas among the various fields of study.

Fairly successful	20%	50%
Mixed feelings	80%	33%
Very unsuccessful	--	16%

G. To gain sufficient rapport with the student so that some help may be given in the event that the problems growing out of personal, family or other relationships may be causing anxiety or difficulty and to make appropriate referrals.

Very successful	20%	33%
Fairly successful	60%	33%
Mixed feelings	--	33%
Fairly unsuccessful	20%	--

* Data were not available from one adviser.

Table 38

Advisers' Responses to Open-end Questions - Spring, 1965

A. In what ways do you feel you have been most valuable to your advisees?

1. As a source of information and security during their first registration.
2. Helping them find answers to specific questions about jobs, majors, courses, etc.
3. By being available - by repeating the idea verbally that they could see me: by actually getting something done to untangle the usual bureaucratic knots that often develop.
4. I think I have been most valuable to my advisees as a listener or a sounding board against which they can verbalize some of their problems, often working out their own answers. I have tried to avoid any identification with a parental relationship. I have stressed accessibility and friendly informal relationship.
5. I have probably been most valuable as a source of information and occasional encouragement. I feel that I did a good job of explaining college requirements--in a positive light. I have helped a few with themes, some times with writing technique, sometimes with suggestions of bibliography or possible approaches. In general, I have been most effective in purely academic matters.

- -

B. What techniques (e.g. kinds of meetings or conferences) have you found to be most useful in working with your advisees?

1. Casual, informal meetings - not in my office.
2. Just being available, I'd say. There when they want you. By telephone or in office.
3. The personal, individual confrontation seems to be the best way to deal with most of these things. I proceed on the logic that we should stress individualization and not the technique.
4. Once students began coming to me on their own I have used personal interviews. From time to time I send dittoed messages to each freshman assigned to me. I feel rather strongly that I could have, and should have, done much more with group meetings.
5. The best method for me is the individual conference in my office. I tried one group meeting, and it was less than successful. I tried a few small group (3-5) meetings in my office, and that worked with some success. Another year I would probably invite small groups in systematically for coffee--perhaps, every two weeks or so.

C. In what ways if any has the additional time you've been able to devote to your advisees had a significant impact upon them?

1. I've been able to have a more complete knowledge of each student.

2. They just never felt rushed, I'd say. I never hurried them out.

3. Psychological, probably, as much as anything. It gives them the idea that we should devote the necessary time for counseling.

4. I can't tell what my impact has been. They can't know the most significant difference--I know them by name and as individuals. Nor do they know that I am writing a paragraph about each of them to put in their folders, for whatever help it may be to their new advisers. In some instances I informed them about academic programs of the college or extra-curricular activities.

- -

D. Has this year's experience had any particular impact upon you? If so, in what way?

1. Yes. This kind of advising program takes much time and not only in "busy" work but in preparing for the student conferences. I'm convinced a program of this nature is highly desirable.

2. I can't say I enjoyed it and I certainly wouldn't want to do it again. I think I might be better with more mature students. People who teach freshmen courses should perhaps not be in this program. They get enough of freshmen in their courses.

3. I think so. It might have made me aware of the fact that I can probably do more for upperclassmen. At the same time, it has put me in touch with a new generation and given me an insight into their problems and thought processes.

4. There have been several impacts:

   a. The pleasure of working with a most interesting group of young people, noting the variety of relationships and occasionally the lack of any meaningful relationship.

   b. I have been impressed by the ease with which I might have persuaded many of these students to follow particular lines of action had I been authoritarian. Initially they expected to be told what to do, reflecting, I suppose, high school and home environments. Because of this I tried to be as non-directive as possible, forcing students to make their own decisions, or in some instances to postpone decisions. I hope that the uncertainty of this approach has been unsettling in a healthy way. Along with this I have tried to be available as the willing listener.

   c. Finally, I am bothered by something of a sense of guilt in not having sought out more opportunities to reach all of the students assigned to me in a meaningful way.

5. I know more about athletes and athletics at Macalester than I did. I also know how hard a student whose gifts are not verbal can work to write a "c" theme.

Table 38 continued

E. What have been the major weaknesses of this year's program? How should the program be changed for next year?

1. My office arrangement in the basement of a dormitory was not convenient. However, this is now changed. Many more opportunities for faculty advisers and advisees to get together need to be arranged.

2. Didn't start soon enough pitching the academic bit at the kids. They should understand right away that this is no beefed-up counseling program--they should see it immediately as an academic program. Maybe send them a paper in the first week. Or immediately bring a paper from one of their courses. I think the Vocational Test came in too soon. Save it for second semester. That gave them the ideas it was just another counseling program.

3. A tendency to paternalism which may be a relative thing after all. This may not be a weakness really. Some students feel they have been made into guinea pigs. They are not resentful about this, but perhaps feel they have been made objects of concern more than others. Perhaps we have tried to do too much in this program regarding objectives.

4. I think the basic weakness of the program this year stems from our own uncertainties about how to proceed. I am convinced that we are most effective with freshmen in the relationships we establish before classes begin and during the first weeks of the fall semester. We need a clear understanding regrading group meetings. I intend to schedule a number right early in the semester. I also intend to give the Columbia Teachers College Library Skills quiz to freshmen assigned to me as soon as I can get them together on campus.

5. The weaknesses in the program are less apparent than the weaknesses in the individual advisers. As to the program, I thought the weekly advisers' meetings got oppressive. Although the symposium on vocational guidance had some moments of interest, it didn't help me at all in that most difficult task. The weaknesses in the individuals are varied. Mine doubtless is that I never made the group feel like a group, now was there any social advantage for them. I'm also of the opinion that I will have the same weakness next year. Most weakness comes from lack of clear definition on our parts; we were clarifying as we went along.

- -

F. What changes, if any, will you (or would you) make in your approach to your advisees next year?

1. I would attempt to schedule more informal meetings.

2. Any log sheets I have not turned in I just didn't fill out. I saw each of these students from between five to fifteen hours. The descriptions of the type of interview on the log-sheets never fit anyway. I saw them each for at least half-an-hour in May about programs for next year.

3. Since I will not be in the program next year, I hesitate to say anything on this. Also, I had a great deal to do with instituting it and am hesitant regarding this also.

4. Basically, I hope to start earlier in working with freshman and to do this intensively.

5. I will explain the nature of the program more clearly. I will present myself as primarily an academic adviser and make no miscellaneous promises of social activities. I will, however, have more group activities in the fall term.

Table 39

Advisers' Responses to Open-end Questions, Spring, 1966

A. What do you feel has been the most successful or greatest accomplishment of the experimental program?

1. During the first year, some Hawthorne effect affected both advisers and students. I didn't feel it this year. The greatest accomplishment has been the attempt to communicate to the advisees that we are available to them, and to feel when they did take advantage of this that we had time to spend with them and should make real efforts to do what we felt necessary or desirable.

2. I think the fact that the faculty advisers in the experimental program have been readily available to their advisees is most significant. The students in the program have been assured of help from their advisers when needed, and I believe this is an important factor for the Freshman Counselees.

3. Pointed up need to modify existing advising procedures, particularly the files.

4. Giving students a sense that adviser will help on academic matters.

5. Closer relationship with advisees.

6. Without question the most successful aspect from my point of view was personal contact with many of the students assigned to me. In only a few cases was the contact definitely negative or missing.

- -

B. What do you feel has been the least successful aspect or major weakness of the experimental program?

1. That students didn't really take advantage of the opportunity is a result of lack of structure (or continuation of traditional structure of faculty adviser) or basis for a meaningful relationship to develop. I also should say that we (I, the whole program) did not take advantage of the situation for the same reasons. Calling them in or having enforced socialization of a randomly selected group made me uncomfortable.

2. I think we have not succeeded in discovering really meaningful ways and means of helping our advisees in addition to those normally used. Although I have had much more contact with my advisees within this program than I would normally have, I do not think I have developed any unique and especially helpful new methods, and I don't think there have been such methods developed by the program as a whole.

3. I don't think students want special treatment.

4. Group or social activities.

5. Imbalance in the amount of time spent with students by different advisers.

6. The least successful aspect from my point of view was my failure to stimulate intellectual involvement of the students I worked with in my organized program.

Table 39 continued

Advisers' Responses to Open-end Questions, Spring, 1966

C. In what ways have you been most valuable to your advisees?

1. The traditional role -- aid in course planning, discussion re: major and career choice, helping define the college for them, intermediary with some college agencies, a referral agency, and a "counselor" to some.
2. In being available when needed and in conferring with them about their academic programs, major fields of interest, and career objectives.
3. Being available.
4. Academic counseling and listening.
5. Availability, good rapport with them, persistence in following through with them.
6. It seems to me that I was most valuable to the advisees by being available, by listening, by asking probing questions and helping them to reach their own decisions, and by responding to parents.

- -

D. In what ways has the additional time you have been able to devote to your advisees had a significant impact on them?

1. I think it essentially made no difference. Other demands, more pressing take up the time.
2. I have no basis for answering this question.
3. None, they didn't take advantage of it.
4. They probably feel freer to talk with me.
5. Enough time for conferences.
6. This is difficult for me to answer inasmuch as I have no basis for comparison. I used time as necessary with the students in individual encounters. As I have indicated, I did little with organized activities.

Table 39 continued

Advisers' Responses to Open-end Questions, Spring, 1966

E. Has this year's experience had any particular impact upon you? If so, in what way?

1. It has made me feel extremely guilty. Typing this has taken an inordinately long time because it makes me uncomfortable to think about it.

2. I have become more familar with the testing program administed to Freshmen and I now feel somewhat competent to interpret their results. I think I am also a little more aware of the problems inherent in the gnerally informal advising system in existence at Macalester and of some things advisers should do that they normal neglect.

3. No, except that it has forced me to think about this complex problem.

4. Not this year.

5. No, I've been advising major students in this same manner.

6. This year's experience has had no unique impact on me other than the impact continuing from the first year's experience. I enjoyed and responded to the stimulation of reasonably intimate involvement with students in their day to day academic affairs.

- -

F. What techniques have you found to be most useful in working with your advisees?

1. I don't really feel that any "worked well". The book discussion and orientation sessions were fine for a starter. Our individual sessions were all right for course planning and S.V.I.B. interpretations and career discussion, and personal counseling for those who wanted it. It is the something more that is missing. Our attempt at series of a student - led group meetings didn't take. Meetings would require a more firm leadership -- some sort of orientation course perhaps.

2. Most useful and successful has been the individual conference. I feel this is the best way to counsel a student. The group meetings I held during the first semester were generally successful but of limited usefulness.

3. Informal get-togethers.

4. Individual meetings in my office.

5. Social at home, individual-informal in office/grill.

6. I depended largely on informal encounters on campus and in my office, usually on the initiative of the various students but occasionally stimulated by memo or other notes from me.

Table 39 continued

Advisers' Responses to Open-end Questions, Spring, 1966

G. From your experience this year, what recommendations do you have for the ongoing faculty advising program?

1. I'm depressed about the whole thing. If it is to be a "program" it requires more than released time. If we are to have a group (other than a series of individuals with relationships with the adviser) some meaningful group activity or the sort of adviser personality who is able to weld this sort of group is needed. (e.g. Stuckey's "medium".) I think too, it needs to be perceived as different from "faculty advising" if it is to move toward the wide goals which were set up. Had we been "preceptors" or something it may have helped remind us of the enlarged expectations. Perhaps not; obviously the name does not make the thing.

2. I think the advising program should become more formal, with a particular effort made to make clear to members of the faculty that advising students is considered to be a part of their regular duties. Faculty members should be available for student conferences; the administration should make this very clear and see that faculty members comply. Generally, a counseling program somewhere between the somewhat ineffective system we now have and what we have tried to do in the experimental program would be desirable. An equitable distribution of advisees among all teaching members of the faculty should also be undertaken. A faculty member with 75 advisees, for example, can hardly perform adequately his duties as a counselor.

3. Keep existing program but set up a system so adviser has a file on each of his advisees.

4. It may be better to have advisees assigned for longer than one year.

5. Time for faculty to advise - Advisers should continue with same advisees for four years.

6. I should like to emphasize the importance of getting to know students assigned as advisees on an individual basis. This is second in importance only to availability to the students. Because in the freshmen year particularly students are uncertain about the selection of a major academic area. I believe it is important for advisers to play down their departmental affiliation and interest. It seems to me also that informality and a lack of a structured approach to counseling are also important.

APPENDIX B

A DESCRIPTION OF THE FIVE SCALES OF THE COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENVIRONMENT SCALES

These five dimensions, corresponding to the five factors, have been labeled as follows: practicality, community, awareness, propriety, and scholarship. The nature of each scale is described below.

Scale 1. Practicality. This combination of items suggests a practical, instrumental emphasis in the college environment. Procedures, personal status, and practical benefits are important. Status is gained by knowing the right people, being in the right groups, and doing what is expected. Order and supervision are characteristic of the administrations and of the class work. Good fun, school spirit, and student leadership in campus social activities are evident.

The atmosphere described by this scale appears to have an interesting mixture of entrepreneurial and bureaucratic features. Organization, system, procedures, and supervision are characteristic of many large enterprises, both public and private, industrial, military, and governmental, but they are limited to large agencies. Such hierarchies as exist, however, may be interpersonal as well as organizational, so that it is not only useful to understand and operate within the system but also to attain status within it by means of personal associations, and political or entrepreneurial activities.

There are, of course, many practical lessons to be learned from living in an environment that has these characteristics and opportunities. Certainly such characteristics are encountered widely in the larger society.

Scale 2. Community. The combination of items in this scale describes a friendly, cohesive, group-oriented campus. The environment is supportive and sympathetic. There is a feeling of group welfare and group loyality which encompasses the college as a whole. The campus is a community. It has a congenial atmosphere.

The small college in a small town immediately comes to mind as a prototype--with friendly and helping relationships among the students and between the strong sense of community; and some small colleges have an atmosphere that is better characterized by privacy, personal autonomy, and cool detachment than by a strong sense of togetherness. On the whole, however, bigness tends to beget diffusiveness rather than cohesion; it also tends to beget impersonality but not necessarily unfriendliness.

If the organizational counterpart of "practicality" was the bureaucracy, perhaps the counterpart to "community" is the family.

Scale 3. Awareness. The items in this scale seem to reflect a concern and emphasis upon three sorts of meaning--personal, poetic, and political. An emphasis upon self-understanding, reflectiveness, and identity suggest the search for personal meaning. A wide range of opportunities for creative and appreciative relationships to painting, music, drama, poetry, sculpture, architecture, etc., suggest the search for poetic meaning. A concern about events around the world, the welfare of mankind, and the present and future condition of man suggest the search for political meaning and idealistic commitment. What seems to be evident in this sort of environment is a stress on awareness, an awareness of self, of society, and of esthetic stimuli.

Perhaps in another sense, these features of a college atmosphere can be seen as a push toward expansion and enrichment--of personality, of societal horizons, and of expressiveness.

Scale 4. Propriety. The items in this scale suggest an environment that is polite and considerate. Caution and thoughtfulness are evident. Group standards of decorum are important. On the negative side, one can describe propriety as the absence of demonstrative, assertive, rebellious, risk-taking, inconsiderate, convention-flouting behavior.

Conventionality, in the sense of generally accepting and abiding by group standards, is in some respects a good term for the items in this scale, although so-called rebellious groups, beatniks for example, have strong conventions to distinguish them from what they think is conventional in others. Perhaps, then, propriety is a better term than conventionality.

In any event, the atmosphere on some campuses is more mannerly, considerate and proper than it is on others.

Scale 5. Scholarship. The items in this scale describe an academic scholarly environment. The emphasis is on competitively high academic achievement and a serious interest in scholarship. The pursuit of knowledge and theories, scientific or philosophical, is carried on rigorously and vigorously. Intellectual speculation, an interest in ideas as ideas, knowledge for its own sake, and intellectual discipline--all these are characteristic of the environment.

APPENDIX C

BRIEF DESCRIPTIONS OF THE SCALES IN THE OMNIBUS PERSONALITY INVENTORY.

Form C--Used with Class of 1968 and in Fall Testing of the Class of 1969.

Thinking Introversion (TI): Persons scoring high on this measure are characterized by a liking for reflective thought, particularly of an abstract nature. They express interests in a variety of areas, such as literature, art and philosophy. Their thinking tends to be less dominated by objective conditions and generally accepted ideas than that of thinking extroverts (low scores). Extroverts show a preference for overt action and tend to evaluate ideas on the basis of their practical immediate application.

Theoretical Orientation (TO): This scale measures interest in science and in scientific activities, including a preference for using the scientific method in thinking. High scorers are generally logical, rational, and critical in their approach to problems.

Estheticism (Es): The high scorers endorse statements indicating diverse interests in artistic matter and activities. The content of the statements in this extends beyond painting, sculpture, and music, and includes interests in literature and dramatics.

Complexity (Co): This measure reflects an experimental orientation rather than a fixed way of viewing and organizing phenomena. High scorers are tolerant of ambiguities and uncertainties, are fond of novel situations and ideas, and are frequently aware of subtle variations in the environment. Most persons high on this dimension prefer to deal with complexity, as opposed to simplicity, and are disposed to seek out and to enjoy diversity and ambiguity.

Autonomy (Au): The characteristic measured is composed of non-authoritarian thinking and a need for independence. High scorers are sufficiently independent of authority, as traditionally imposed through social institutions, that they oppose infringements on the rights of individuals. They are non-judgmental, realistic, and intellectually liberal.

Developmental Status (Ds): This scale differentiates between older and younger college students. High scorers are more like seniors in their attitudes and thinking. They express more rebelliousness toward authority, especially when it is institutionalized in family, school, church, or state. They are less authoritarian than the low scorer and, at the same time, freer to express impulses.

Impulse Expression (IE): This scale assesses a general readiness to express impulses and to seek gratification either in conscious thought or in overt action. The high scorers value sensations, have an active imagination, and their thinking if often dominated by feelings and fantasies.

Schizoid Functioning (SF): The high scorers admit to attitudes and behaviors that characterize socially alienated persons. Along with feelings of isolation, loneliness, and rejection, they may intentionally avoid others and experience feelings of hostility and aggression. The ego weakness of high scorers may be characterized by identity confusion, daydreaming, dis-orientation, feelings of importance and fear of loss of control.

Social Introversion (SI): The high scorers withdraw from social contacts and responsibilities. They display little interest in people or in being with them. The social extroverts (low scorers), on the other hand, seek social contacts and gain satisfaction from them.

Religious Liberalism (RL): The high scorers are skeptical of religious beliefs and practices and tend to reject most of them, especially those that are orthodox or fundamentalistic.

Social Maturity (SM): High scorers are not authoritarian, and they are flexible, tolerant, and realistic in their thinking. They are not dependent upon authority, rules, or rituals for managing social relationships. In general they are impunitive, although capable of expressing aggression directly when it is appropriate. High scorers are also frequently interested in intellectual and esthetic pursuits.

Masculinity - Feminity (MF): This scale assesses differences in attitudes and interests between college men and women. High scorers (Masculine) express interests in science and in problem solving; they admit to few adjustment problems, feelings of anxiety, or personal inadequacies. They also tend to be somewhat less sociable and less esthetically oriented than low scorers.

Repression and Suppression (RS): The high scorers are inhibited, prudent, and cautious, as expressed in their attitudes toward themselves and toward others. Consequently, they tend to reject items that express social alienation, unconventional or socially undesirable behavior. Low scorers, on the contrary, are relatively uninhibited and lacking in prudence and caution. The most realistic college students probably score near the mean.

Form Fx--Used for Spring Testing of the Class of 1969.

Thinking Introversion (TI): Persons scoring high on this measure are characterized by a liking for reflective thought and academic activities. They express interests in a broad range of ideas and in variety of areas, such as literature, art and philosophy. Their thinking is less dominated by objective conditions and generally accepted ideas than that of thinking extroverts (low scores). Most extroverts show a preference for over action and tend to evaluate ideas on the basis of their practical, immediate application.

Theoretical Orientation (TO): This scale measures an interest in, or orientation to, a more restricted range of ideas than is true of TI. High scores are interested in science and in some scientific activities, including a preference for using the scientific method in thinking. They are generally logical, analytical, and critical in their approach to problems.

Estheticism (Es): High scorers endorse statements indicating diverse interests in, as well as, an appreciation of, artistic matters and activities. The focus of their interests tends to extend beyond painting, sculpture and music and includes interests in literature and dramatics.

Complexity (Co): This measure reflects an experimental orientation rather than a fixed way of viewing and organizing phenomena. High scorers are tolerant of ambiguities and uncertainties; they are generally fond of novel situations and ideas. Most high scorers very much prefer to deal with diversity and complexity, as opposed to simplicity and structure, and are disposed to seek out and enjoy unusual ambiguous events and experiences.

Autonomy (Au): The characteristic measured is composed of non-authoritarian attitudes and a need for independence. High scorers are sufficiently independent of authority, as traditionally imposed through social institutions, that they oppose infringements on the rights of individuals. They are tolerant of viewpoints other than their own, and they are non-judgmental, realistic and intellectually liberal.

Religious Orientation (RO): High scorers are skeptical of conventional religious beliefs and practices and tend to reject most of them, especially those that are manifesting a liberal view of religious beliefs, and low scorers tend to be conservative in general and rejecting of other viewpoints. (The direction of scoring on this scale, with strong religious commitment indicated by low scores, was determined in part by the correlation between these items and the first four scales which together measure a general intellectual disposition.)

Social Extroversion (SE): This measure reflects a preferred style of relating to people in a social context. High scorers, displaying a strong interest in being with people, seek social activities and gain satisfaction from them. The social introvert (low scorer) tends to withdraw from social contacts and responsibilities.

Impulse Expression (IE): This scale assesses a general readiness to express impulses and to seek gratification either in conscious thought or in overt action. High scores have an active imagination, value sensual reactions, and their thinking and behavior has pervasive overtones of feelings and fantasies.

Personal Integration (PI): The high scorer admits to few attitudes and behaviors that characterize anxious, disturbed or socially alienated persons. Low scorers on the other hand, may intentionally avoid others and often express hostility and aggressions. They also indicate feelings of loneliness, rejection and aggressions. They also indicate feelings of loneliness, rejection and isolation.

Anxiety Level (AL): High scorers deny that they have feelings or symptoms of anxiety and do not admit to being nervous or worried. Low scorers are generally tense and high-strung and often experience some difficulty adjusting in their social environment.

Altruism (Am): The high scorer is an affiliative person and trusting in his relations with others. He exibits concern for the feelings and welfare of people he meets. Low scorers tend to be much less concerned about the welfare of others and often view people from an impersonal, distant perspective.

Practical Outlook (PO): The high scorer on this measure is interested in practical, applied activities and tends to value material possessions and concrete accomplishments. The criterion most often used to evaluate ideas and things is one of immediate utility. Authoritarianism, conservatism and non-intellectual interests are very frequent personality components of persons scoring above the average.

Masculinity-Feminity (MF): This scale assess some of the differences in attitudes and interests between college men and women. High scorers (masculine) deny interests in esthetic matters and they admit to few adjustment problems, feelings of anxiety, or personal inadequacies. They also tend to be somewhat less socially inclined than low scorers and more interested in scientific matters. Low scorers (feminine), besides stronger esthetic and social inclinations, also admit to greater sensitivity and emotionality.

Response Bias (RB): This measure represents an approach to assessing the students test-taking attitude. High scorers are responding to this measure in a manner similar to a group of students who were explicitly asked to make a good impression by their responses to these items. Low scorers, on the contrary, may be trying to make a bad impression.

APPENDIX D

Student Questionnaire

Name________________________________
Last First Middle

_____ Sex 1. Male 2. Female

_____ Year 1. Freshman 2. Sophomore 3. Junior 4. Senior

_____ Transfer Student 1. Yes 2. No

_____ Year you enrolled at Macalester College

_____ Do you intend to return to Macalester next year? 1. Yes 2. No 3. Undecided 4. Doesn't apply (Graduating Senior).

_____ Do you intend to graduate from Macalester? 1. Yes 2. No, I plan to transfer to another school. 3. No, I don't plan to graduate from college. 4. Undecided.

_____ Major field or probable major field. (Use department number from below).

_____ If you have changed your major field since enrollement at Macalester, what was (were) the department number (s) of your previous major (s)?

_____ This year I am living: 1. On-campus 2. Off-campus 3. Apartment 4. At home 5. With relatives.

FINE ARTS

10. Art
11. Music
12. Speech and Drama

HUMANITIES

20. English
21. French
22. German
23. Greek and Latin
24. Humanities
25. Philosophy
26. Religion
27. Russian
28. Spanish

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

30. Astronomy
31. Biology
32. Chemistry
33. General Science
34. Geology
35. Mathematics
36. Physics

SOCIAL OR BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

40. Economics
41. Education
42. Elementary Education
43. Geography
44. History
45. Journalism
46. Physical Education
47. Political Science
48. Psychology
49. Sociology
50. Other______________________
Please Specify

As problems have arisen during the year, with whom were you most likely to discuss them? (Circle the appropriate X's).

	Course Planning	Career Planning	Study Prob.	Financial Problems	Personal Problems	Other Problems (Please Specify
A fellow student	X	X	X	X	X	X
My parents	X	X	X	X	X	X
My residence counselor	X	X	X	X	X	X
Counseling office	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dean of Students' Office	X	X	X	X	X	X
Chaplain or Assistant Chaplain	X	X	X	X	X	X
College Physician's Office	X	X	X	X	X	X
My faculty adviser	X	X	X	X	X	X
My course instructor	X	X	X	X	X	X
Another member of the faculty	X	X	X	X	X	X
My minister	X	X	X	X	X	X
Someone else__________ Please specify	X	X	X	X	X	X
I had no problems of this type this year	X	X	X	X	X	X
I had a few problems of this type, but I didn't discuss them with anyone	X	X	X	X	X	X

Please place a check mark in front of the types of activities in which you have: 1) Participated this year. 2) Held a leadership role this year.

Participant	Leadership Role	
_____	_____	1. Policy making and governmental boards and councils e.g. Community Council or Dorm Council.
_____	_____	2. Citizenship and International e.g. International Club or Young Republicans.
_____	_____	3. Religious e.g. L.S.A., UCCF.
_____	_____	4. Publications and Radio.
_____	_____	5. Fine Arts e.g. Band, choir, Drama Choros.
_____	_____	6. Academic e.g. French Club, Geology Club, SNEA.
_____	_____	7. Varsity Athletics.
_____	_____	8. Other Athletics and Recreational e.g. Intramural athletics, Alpine Club, WRA.
_____	_____	9. Social e.g. Union Board, Chess Club.
_____	_____	10. Other________________________________ (Please Specify)

_____1. College students have different ideas about the main purposes of a college education. Some of their ideas are listed below. Rank the two goals most important to you by circling the 1 next to the most important goal and 2 next to the second most important.

1 2 A. Provide vocational training; develop skills and techniques directly applicable to your career.
1 2 B. Develop your ability to get along with different kinds of people.
1 2 C. Provide a basic general education and appreciation of ideas.
1 2 D. Develop your knowledge of and interest in community and world problems.
1 2 E. Help develop your moral capacities, ethical standards, and values.
1 2. F. Prepare you for a happy marriage and family life.

_____2. What is the highest educational level you plan to achieve? 1. Junior college diploma or some college. 2. Bachelor of Arts or Science Degree. 3. Bachelor of Law (LLB). 4. Bachelor of Divinity (B.D.). 5. Doctor of Dental Surgery (DDS). 6. Doctor of Medicine (MD). 7. Master of Arts or Science (MA, MS). 8. Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

_____3. In terms of your own personal satisfaction, how much importance do you attach to getting good grades? 1. A great deal. 2. A moderate amount. 3. Only a little. 4. None at all.

_____4. How important is it for you to graduate from college? 1. Extremely important. 2. Quite important. 3. Fairly important. 4. Not very important.

_____5. When do you expect that you will marry? Check one. 1. I am already married. 2. Before graduating from college. 3. Within one year after graduation. 4. After one year but within five years after graduation. 5. After five years after graduation. 6. Never.

_____6. On the last page of this questionnaire is a listing of a number of technical and professional occupations. Refer to this list in answering the next question. Write the number assigned to the occupation in the appropriate space at the left when you answer these questions. My present career choice is. (Write the appropriate number in the space to the left).

_____7. How satisfied are you with your present choice of a career? 1. Well satisfied. 2. Moderately satisfied (some reservations). 3. Dissatisfied but intend not to change. 4. Dissatisfied and intend to change it. 5. Very much undecided about future career.

_____8. If I were absolutely free to choose a career (ignoring finances and all other constraints) my career choice would be: (Write the appropriate number in the space at the left.)

_____9. My faculty adviser this year had: 1. Pretty much left me alone and simply signed my program of courses. 2. Given me some suggestions as to courses I should take. 3. Carefully helped me work out my entire college course program. 4. Helped me with problems of study, course work, etc. 5. Been available to discuss with me intellectual issues, personal problems, and vocational goals.

____10. Scheduling meetings with my faculty adviser this year has been: 1. Very easy 2. Fairly easy 3. Fairly difficult 4. Very difficult.

____11. In helping with decisions I had to make this year, I felt my faculty adviser was: 1. Very adequately informed. 2. Fairly adequately informed. 3. Somewhat inadequately informed. 4. Very inadequately informed.

____12. The approximate number of times I have had conferences with my faculty adviser this year is: 1. Less than three. 2. Three to five. 3. Six to ten. 4. More than ten times.

____13. Thinking about the number of conferences I have had with my faculty adviser this year: 1. I would like to have had more. 2. I would like to have had fewer. 3. I feel the number of conferences has been about right.

____14. Taking everything into consideration, my feeling about the faculty adviser I have had this year is: 1. I'm very satisfied. 2. I'm fairly satisfied. 3. I have mixed feelings. 4. I'm fairly dissatisfied. 5. I'm very dissatisfied.

____15. SENIORS OMIT. Next year, I wish that my faculty adivser would: 1. Pretty much leave me alone and simply sign my program of courses. 2. Give me some suggestions as to courses I should take. 3. Carefully help me work out my entire college course program. 4. Help me with problems of study, course work, etc. 5. Be available to discuss with me intellectual issues, personal problems, and vocational goals.

16. Please rate yourself on the following dimensions as you really think you are. (Circle one in each row).

a.	Unfavorable toward modern art	Very 1	Fairly 2	Neither 3	Fairly 4	Very 5	Favorable toward modern ar
b.	Politically liberal	1	2	3	4	5	Politically conservative
c.	Conventional in opinions and values	1	2	3	4	5	Unconventional in opinions an values
d.	Religious	1	2	3	4	5	Non-religious

17. Please rate the following in terms of their effect on your long-term plans:

	Very Imp.	Somewhat Imp.	Unimportant	Received no help of this kind
A. Vocational or psychological tests	X	X	X	X
B. Discussions with faculty adviser	X	X	X	X
C. Discussions with faculty members other than advisers	X	X	X	X
D. Advice from parents	X	X	X	X
E. Interviews with a counselor	X	X	X	X
F. High school teacher	X	X	X	X

____ 18. Taking everything into consideration, my feeling about my educational experience at Macalester College is: 1. I'm very satisfied. 2. I'm fairly satisfied. 3. I have mixed feelings. 4. I'm fairly dissatisfied. 5. I'm very dissatisfied.

____ 19. The statement which best summarizes my reaction to Macalester College is: 1. I have liked it even more than I thought I would
2. It has been about what I expected (any my expectations were high).
3. It has been about what I expected (but I didn't expect much).
4. I'm dissappointed--it hasn't lived up to my expectations.

The College is interested in continually evaluating its faculty advising program. The following have been suggested as possible ways in which faculty advising could be improved. Please place a check mark in front of those suggestions which you would most like to see implemented. Double check the one which you feel is most important.

____ 1. More opportunity for individual conferences or meetins with advisers. What would you like to discuss at these conferences.________________

____ 2. More opportunities for group conferences or meetings with advisers. What would you like to discuss at these conferences.________________

____ 3. Release time for professors to serve as faculty advisers.

____ 4. Keep advisers more adequately informed.

____ 5. Select only qualified and interested advisers.

____ 6. Assign freshmen to advisers who are in their major field of interest.

____ 7. Assign freshmen to advisers without regard to major field of interest.

____ 8. Have Man and His World instructors serve as freshman advisers.

____ 9. Other________________

____10. It's fine as it is.

The thing I like best about Macalester College is____________________

The thing I like least about Macalester College is____________________

Macalester College could best be improved by____________________

Other comments:____________________

1. Accountant or auditor
2. Actor, musician, entertainer.
3. Advertising man
4. Anthropologist
5. Archaeologist
6. Architect
7. Armed forces officer
8. Artist, designer, sculptor
9. Banker
10. Biological scientist (biologist, botanist, physiologist)
11. Chemist
12. College administrator
13. Clergyman (minister, priest, rabbi, etc.)
14. Dentist
15. Draftsman
16. Economist
17. Elected or appointed official - mayor, senator, judge, etc.
18. Engineer - civil, chemical, electrical, mechanical, etc.
19. Forester
20. Geographer
21. Geologist
22. Journalist - editor, reporter.
23. Lawyer - not elected or appointed official
24. Librarian
25. Mathematician
26. Mortician
27. Nurse
28. Optometrist
29. Osteopath or chiropractor
30. Pharmacist
31. Physician or surgeon
32. Physicist
33. Physical Therapist
34. Political scientist
35. Psychologist
36. Public Administrator
37. Sociologist
38. Social or welfare worker
39. Statistician
40. Surveyor
41. Teacher, elementary school
42. Teacher, English
43. Teacher, business education
44. Teacher, English
45. Teacher, foreign language
46. Teacher, home economics
47. Teacher, industrial arts
48. Teacher, math, science
49. Teacher, music
50. Teacher, social science
51. Teacher, vocational agriculture
52. Technician, medical or dental
53. Veterinarian
54. Writer, creative, poet, novelist, etc.
55. A technical occupation not listed above.
56. A scientific occupation not listed above.
57. A professional occupation not listed above.

References

Beaumont, Henry The evaluation of academic counseling. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1939, 2, 79-82.

Brown, William F. Student-to-student counseling for academic adjustment. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1965, 811-817.

Cameron, Marian L. An evaluation of a faculty advisory program. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1952, 12, 730-740.

Campbell, D. P. *The results of counseling: twenty-five years later.* Philadelphia:Saunders, 1965.

Jamrich, John Organizational practices in student-faculty counseling programs in small colleges. *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 1955, 41, 36-40.

Jones, Lonzo Faculty counseling for freshmen. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1947, 7, 564-568.

Jones, Howard L. Preceptorial counseling at Colgate University. *Occupations*, 1950, 28, 453-454.

Kiell, Norman Freshman evaluation of faculty counselors. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1957, 35, 361-364.

Koile, Earl A. Faculty and the university counseling center. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1960, 7, 293-297.

Morehead, Charles G. and Johnson, J. Clyde Some effects of a faculty advising program. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1964, 139-144.

Paterson, Donald G. and Clark, Kenneth E. Students judgments of counseling. *Journal of Higher Education*, 1943, 14, 140-142.

Sander, Daryl L. Experimental educational advising in men's residence halls. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1964, 42, 787-790.